THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1938. Vol. XXVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Jewish Problem and its Solution.

The execrable treatment of the Jews in Germany and elsewhere directs attention acutely to both the problem and the tragedy of Judaism. The Jews are not more vicious than other races, but they certainly seem to suffer more. Nearly 2,500 years ago one of their prophets wrote of Zion :

> 'She hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins' (*Isaiah* xl, 2).

Many centuries later a Christian apostle wrote of the Jews to a Christian congregation in Salonica :

> 'For ye, brethren, became imitators of the churches of God which are in Judaea in Christ Jesus : for ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they did of the Jews : who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drave out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men : forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved : to fill up their sins alway : but the wrath to come upon them to the uttermost' (*I Thess.* ii, 14-16).

The tragedy of Judaism is the disaster which ensues from making wrong choices. Some nationalities, like some individuals, seem to have few choices offered to them. Others, like the folk-lore heroes, have many. The Jews in their long history

have had many choices proffered to them : choices, it is true, of the most difficult kind and yet of the greatest significance and potentiality. This significance and potentiality they have failed at the time to recognize, and have, as a consequence, chosen wrong. Professor George Adam Smith affirmed that the treasure and the mystery of Israel's religion is its prophetism. Yet Judaism has valued its prophetism lightly. Jesus in his Lamentation over Jerusalem apostrophized her, not unjustly, as 'the slayer of the prophets.' The prophets condemned the traditional sacrificial religion of the nation and strove to replace it by a religion which was progressively ethical and spiritual. They failed. This was not all. The prophets opposed the rigid exclusiveness and narrow nationalism of Judaism and substituted for it the ideal of a missionary nation, ministering to the moral and religious needs of all humanity. Again they failed.

Later, by Jesus, these offers were renewed in His gospel of the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man. But the Jews again rejected them for a fanatically nationalist, ceremonialist legalism. St. Paul renewed the offer in the name of spiritual and religious universalism, but it was again rejected with persecution. Drunk with a spirit of militarist nationalism, the Jews, although warned that they that take the sword shall perish by the sword, twice dared to challenge the might of the Roman Empire, and were, as a consequence, extirpated from their native land. A most extraordinary history, and one which led the Duc de Sully, in reply to Henri IV's question, to cite the Jews as the greatest proof of the truth of the Christian religion.

There are many philosophies of history. The Christian philosophical historian will not exclude as contributory causes to the present miserable conditions of the Jews those factors in their sufferings presented with so much sympathy and discrimination by Dr. James Parkes in *The Jew and his Neighbour*.[1] Where, however, we find ourselves unable to agree with Dr. Parkes is in his antithesis between historical causes and supernatural causes :

> 'The Jewish problem, like all others, has its roots in history and in human nature, and not in anything supernatural.'

[1] *The Jew and his Neighbour*. By James Parkes, M.A., D.Phil. (S.C.M. 3*s*. 6*d*. 1938.)

This antithesis between the natural and the supernatural does not exist for the essentially Christian philosopher, nor indeed for the essentially Jewish philosopher. Both believe that they see a divine purpose realizing itself in the creative process in Nature and in history: and that it is only by the acceptance of this hypothesis that a true interpretation of the Universe can be secured. Supposing that there be a divine purpose operating through human history: and supposing that the Jewish race became, as the result of divine selection, a peculiarly important factor in the working out of that purpose; and supposing that the Jews failed signally to respond rightly to it: might not their making that right response, even to-day, secure for them what the great Greek dramatists called a *peripeteia*, or reversal of action, by which their lost opportunities might all be regained and turned to their own great advantage, as well as to that of mankind? This was St. Paul's view (*Rom.* ix-xi). Many will regard it as the whimsical dream of a Jewish patriot whose spiritualistic hallucinations led him into a policy of Jewish defeatism for which he sought to atone by this theory.

The practical import of the teaching of the Jewish prophets, Jesus Christ and the Christian apostles is plainly this: unless the Jew — and how impossible this must seem — is prepared to lose himself in the higher and fuller life of the community in which he finds himself, and he can only do this by becoming in the truest sense Christian — that is to say, much more Christian than most of those by whom he is surrounded—there is no prospect of any permanent and satisfactory solution of the Jewish problem. Jeremiah wrote to the Jewish exiles of his day:

> 'Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captive, and pray unto the Lord for it: for in the peace thereof ye shall have peace' (*Jeremiah* xxix, 7).

This divine demand, that a nation should sacrifice its nationalism—and in the case of the Jews this entails also the sacrifice of the separatist and particularist features of their religious life — must seem too great to be granted. Liberal Judaism, in response to the prophetic inspiration of the Jewish race, has seen the vision and has been seeking amid the greatest opposition from Traditional Judaism to realize that vision. If Liberal Judaism can succeed in its crusade, it will solve the Jewish problem.

An article of poignant interest by Mr. L. G. Montefiore, President of the Anglo-Jewish Association, dealing with 'The Destiny of the Jews,' appeared in the *British Weekly* for Nov. 17th, 1938. In that article Mr. Montefiore writes:

> 'Whatever their virtues may be as men and women, whatever their intellectual achievements, their abilities, their brains, Jews *qua* Jews seem to me to be of interest to the world uniquely and solely on account of the religion they profess. It is that and that alone that justifies their continued existence as a separate community. If Judaism has no further contribution to make to the world's spiritual values, then the sooner the Jews disappear the better.'

Acu tetigisti! Has the Jew, as Jew, any 'further contribution to make to the world's spiritual values'? Has not the Christian religion, which in its purest form is essentially prophetic Judaism, made some measure of that further contribution? And must not further contributions of moral and spiritual value be made on these lines?

The primitive Christians—and they were Jews—believed that Judaism had attained its consummation in the religion of Christ. Were they wrong? Has not the subsequent history both of Judaism and of Christianity produced for ethical theists substantial evidence that they were right? It is true that the Christian Church, that is the organized society brought into existence by the Christian religion, has shewn itself, on many occasions in its long history, as hostile to the essential Christian values as Judaism has shewn itself to be, if not, *horribile dictu*, more so. It was William Blake who wrote:

> 'I fear this Jesus will not do
> Either for Englishman or Jew.'

Nevertheless, the values of the religion of Jesus stand, however much that religion may be misinterpreted, misrepresented, corrupted, betrayed by the Christian Church. It is only by the mutual recognition of the validity—not simply 'the conservation of values' but 'the augmentation of values'—of the Christian principles, by both Jew and Gentile, that the peace of mankind and the peace of the Jew can be found.

There is, as we see it, and we have to say it frankly, no place for Jewish separatism in the modern world. It is an anachronism, an anomaly, a disaster, the mother of tragedies. Paul, the *quondam* Pharisee of Pharisees, declared that Christ had broken

down the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile. It is the maintenance of this legalist and nationalist separatism by the Jew which is one large factor in his troubles, and it is perhaps the greatest impediment to his serving mankind in that high moral and spiritual service which Mr. L. G. Montefiore, true to the spirit of the prophets, desires for Judaism.

But while Mr. Montefiore's article never wavers in its conviction of the religious significance of Judaism, there is a note of querulousness in its concluding paragraph. He writes:

> 'The problem presented by Jewish suffering is not in itself different from the problem presented by the suffering of millions of others of different race and belief. It is only as believers in an ancient creed, which for two thousand years and more has exerted such immense influence on mankind, that Jews and Jewish destiny acquire a distinctive and separate interest and importance.
>
> It is for that reason, more than for any other, that we ask ourselves with anxiety what is to happen to the Jews, and is the faith maintained and cherished through so many centuries destined to disappear and to be swept away into the limbo of forgotten things?'

Mr. Montefiore is not entirely convinced that this religious significance will be realized. He does not see clearly, and how almost impossible it must be for a devoted Jew to see it, that the Jewish community, if it is to realize its religious significance and to discharge its religious service to mankind to the full, can only do so by being subsumed in a Christian fellowship, loyal to the moral and spiritual prophetism which Primitive Christianity inherited from the Jews. Is there not need in this dark hour for a yet further step forward in the programme of Liberal Judaism?

CONTINUANCE.[2]

Perhaps the grace most needed by the Modernist is the grace of final perseverance. This grace is not only the antidote of pessimism and inertia, but also of facile optimism and, not least, of that weariness in well-doing to which even the good succumb. This conviction, we imagine, inspired Mr. Godfrey-Thomas when he founded his little Modernist magazine, *Continuance*, which has now passed into its sixth volume. We wish for it, since it is enlightened, practical and fearless, the widest influence.

[2] A magazine for Modern Church people. Editor: The Rev. C. Godfrey-Thomas, 47 Albert Road, Harborne, Birmingham 17.

That influence could be greatly augmented by *Continuance* being adopted as an inset in parochial and ruri-decanal magazines. Its use in this direction has already begun. We hope that Modernist vicars will assist in the popularization of Modernist teaching by this means. Its editorial board consists of a group of the younger Modernist clergy.

In the November issue, its opening article 'Straws and the Wind' is contributed by the Rev. H. Fletcher. He writes:

> 'Notable speeches at the Bristol Church Congress indicate that Anglican leaders are growing increasingly aware of the need for doctrinal and liturgical revision, and for more courageous efforts towards practical reunion. Few, however, yet realise how radical must be the remedies for our present discontents, how drastic the changes for which forward-looking Christians must be prepared. It is not too much to say that the need of the hour is for reformation even more than reformulation.
>
> This is not to urge yet another alignment of coloured shirts or "fronts." At the same time it is true that a fundamental agreement exists between those of modern outlook within otherwise widely divergent religious groups. They should speak with a united voice on questions affecting human destinies. There is a convergence of basic belief as between more progressive modernists in the Anglican and Free Churches, the Unitarians, the Society of Friends and the Liberal Jews. They should join forces on a common basis of monotheism, purged of superstition, magic and mystery cultus, with which to confront a world increasingly subjugated to lower, reactionary ideals, like those of the totalitarian state. We are coming to the verge of a clash between internationalism, motivated by the religious ethic of Jesus, on the one hand, and the dehumanized, materialistic, God-renouncing values and internecine struggles of a world of totalitarian states and their mechanized slaves on the other. What a tragedy if, through their myopic adherence to obsolete loyalties, the true spiritual descendants of Jesus should be paralysed by their present divisions.
>
> For too long, honest, progressive thought within Christianity has been impeded by a superstitious deference to Greek philosophical categories, Jewish apocalyptic and cosmology, and the crude sacrificial, blood-covenant obsessions of an ancient, semi-barbarous Bedouin tribe. Can we not win clear of these shackles, and learn again, in its purity, the religion of Jesus? a religion which, whatever the limitations of its historical setting, stands yet with its challenge still unfaced. We shall find that by itself it is more than enough for our feeble wills and cold affections. Let Christianity, the religion of Jesus, win free of the shrouds which have wrapped it about — the extraneous trappings and accretions of traditional catholicism — and it will rise again and shine forth as the guiding star of our generation. To bring about this emancipation of the Spirit is the task to which Christians of this generation should dedicate themselves.'

We are not in favour of hurricanes, but many of our poorly-ventilated churches would gain much if there were more wind of this kind penetrating their stagnant atmosphere.

CATHOLIC, CALVINIST, BUT NOT CHRISTIAN.

That traditional theology is steadily losing its grip of the modern mind is the by no means novel conclusion of Mr. Reginald Dingle in a provocative article entitled 'The Decline of Theology in England' published in the December number of the *Nineteenth Century*. Being himself originally a Protestant who twenty years ago became a Roman Catholic, Mr. Dingle judiciously restricts his survey and criticisms to the non-Roman English religious world. Mr. Dingle's theology has much in common with that of John Milton, who sang:

> 'Of Man's first disobedience and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden.'

He is convinced that the real cause of the decline of interest in Christianity is due to disbelief in the historic fact of the Fall of Man.

We believe him to be wrong. This prevalent disbelief in the historic Fall is not a cause but a symptom. The historic Fall has been proved, as far as it is possible to prove these things, not to be historic. In that case, why should the modern man believe in it as historic? If a system of theology bases itself upon the historic fact of the Fall, and the Fall is not historic, then that system of theology has no longer any right to be believed in, and it would be detrimental to human welfare that it should be believed in.

It would seem to be the case that the traditional Catholic theology does base itself upon the historic fact of the Fall, and in that case (and just in so far as it does so) it demands either to be revised or to be rejected. It may be Catholic—indeed it *is* Catholic—to believe in the historic fact of the Fall, but is it Christian? It will be replied that orthodox Christians, whether Papalist or Protestant, are agreed that such a belief is essential. This only indicates, what we have often emphasized, that in the modern Christian world the deepest cleavage is not between Protestants and Romanists, but between Modernists and Traditionalists. Nevertheless, the fundamental question still remains: Is this belief in the historic fact of the Fall an essential Christian belief? St. Paul believed in it; so did St. Augustine; so

did Martin Luther and John Calvin. But did Jesus Christ? There is no evidence that He did. It is often supposed that He did, because, according to our English version, He said on one occasion :

> 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?' (*Mt.* vii, 11).

Here it was thought for centuries that Jesus was referring to the essential depravity of human nature due to an historic Fall, but He was doing nothing of the kind. The correct translation of the passage is :

> 'If ye being hard men of business, yet know how to be generous to your own children, how much more shall your heavenly Father be generous to you?'

Jesus Christ recognized the fact of sin in human nature, but He taught nothing whatsoever about the Fall, nor is His teaching about sin in any way dependent upon the Fall as a historic fact. It is in harmony with our modern psychological knowledge, and it is sin as a fact of psychological experience, not the Fall as a fact of history, which the Christian Church is concerned with in its moral and spiritual work to-day.

The Next Morern Churchmen's Conference.

Dean Inge in his latest volume *Our Present Discontents*[3] says of the Doctrinal Report of 1938.

> 'The Modern Churchmen's Union has very little to fight about. Our occupation is gone.'

With the first of these two sentences we agree. The Church authorities are definitely on the side of comprehensiveness. We Modernists have no need to contend any longer for the ideal of a comprehensive Church prepared to admit a variety of doctrinal views and teaching. With the second sentence we disagree. Our occupation as Modernists is not gone. If the ideals for which we have contended are not to be lost we must secure their practical realization, and that by devoting ourselves strenuously to the cause of modern Christian education and the achieve-

[3] *Our Present Discontents*. By W. R. Inge. (Putnam, London. 7*s*. 6*d*. 1938.)

ment of doctrinal and liturgical reform in harmony with our progressive advance into the truth. It is with this object in view that the next Modern Churchmen's Conference — which is to meet at Girton College, Cambridge, from August 28 to Sept. 2, 1939, under the presidency of Sir Cyril Norwood—has selected as its subject 'A Comprehensive Church.'

The value of the Doctrinal Report is found not only in its spirit of religious comprehensiveness and religious tolerance, but also in the fact that it presents to students of the Church of England a variety of doctrinal views, all held by various and important sections of practising English Churchmen. The defect of the Report is that no attempt is made to secure a higher synthesis of these conflicting views.

It should be noted that Dean Inge in his latest volume recognizes that the work of the Doctrinal Commission is only preparatory:

> 'The report issued by the joint conference claims only to be "a useful basis for further work." This is the utmost that can be claimed for it' (p. 140).

It is sometimes forgotten that the scope of reference prescribed for the Doctrinal Commission was twofold:

> 'To consider the nature and grounds of Christian doctrine with a view to demonstrating the extent of existing agreement within the Church of England and with a view to investigating how far it is possible to remove or diminish existing differences.' (*Doctrine in the Church of England*, p. 19.)

The first half of the task to be accomplished by the Commission was achieved by them in their Report; but the second half — and who will not regard it as the more important? — remains to be done. This higher synthesis can only be secured as the result of a further development in the continuity of Christian thought, and it is hoped that the Conference papers will serve as a practical contribution towards this end.

JESUS AND SACRIFICE

By C. J. Wright, B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology and the Philosophy of Religion, Didsbury College, Manchester.

A CONSIDERABLE literature has appeared of recent years on what is usually called by theologians *The Atonement.* The most noteworthy feature of the trend of discussion is, I think, a manifest endeavour to resist the advance of Abelardian views. Such views—as must be obvious to any intelligent listener to sermons who is acquainted with the sermonic literature of the past—have advanced unmistakably during this generation. Theological literature, in accord with the law of the pendulum, hastens to stay or correct the tendency. Something vital, it is believed, or felt, is in peril of being lost. Out of this belief, or feeling, has come the 'conservative' reaction from that 'liberal' view which not only maintained that such dogmatic ideas as substitution, satisfaction, penalty, propitiatory or expiatory sacrifice, are not required in Christianity but had no place in the teaching of Jesus. Since Dr. Hastings Rashdall published his book, *The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology*—the best and most influential modern discussion and statement of this 'liberal' view—there has been, as far at least as theological literature is concerned, a manifest reaction. I repeat, 'as far as theological literature is concerned,' for there are, as yet, few indications that the reaction has spread to the pulpit, to the hymn-writer, or to the intelligent occupant of the pew, to say nothing about those of moral and religious outlook outside the churches.

No modern Christian can write about this issue without discussing the teaching of Jesus Himself. However far our speculative theories go beyond the direct teaching of our Lord, that teaching is usually taken as the final criterion for their Christian validity. Since the dawn of the historical and scientific era no writer on these subjects imagines that he can argue the matter out in the abstract. We have no confidence in the high *a priori* road which Anselm trod so confidently. No longer can we begin our discussions, as did the author of *Cur Deus Homo?*, by setting out 'to prove by necessary reasoning that (Christ being

left out of the question as though nothing were known of Him) it is impossible for any man to be saved without Him.' The assumptions Anselm so confidently made can no longer be taken for granted. The 'necessary reasoning' based on these assumptions no longer appears to us as either necessary or cogent. We tread a more modest way. We ask, not, What does 'necessary reasoning' prove? but, What does human experience permit? Like T. H. Huxley, we know that we must first sit down patiently before the facts, and then follow where they lead us. And inasmuch as the teaching and Person of Jesus constitute the most significant fact for the Christian, all his speculative endeavours have to be tested in that crucible. If our theories contradict what we know of the life and teaching of our Lord they will have to be repudiated.

Now one of the significant features of the 'conservative' reaction to which I have alluded is the endeavour to maintain that penal, substitutionary or 'representative,' and expiatory conceptions are found in His teaching and in accord with His 'mind.' To put the matter succinctly, it has of recent years been frequently said that Jesus thought of His sufferings and death *in terms of sacrifice*, that the sacrificial cultus had a 'religious value' to Him, and that, therefore, some kind of sacrificial cultus belongs for all time to the Christian religion. To discuss briefly this issue is the aim of this paper.

It is obvious that we are engaged in a mere game of spurious dialectic unless there is a clear understanding of what such terms as 'sacrifice' and 'the religious value' of the sacrificial cultus mean. Leaving on one side the modern uses of the term 'sacrifice'—where it is taken metaphorically, and every association with the sacrificial cultus has disappeared—we may say that an essential idea in every 'sacrifice' was that some animal or some thing should be *offered* to God. The animal or thing, obviously, did not *offer* itself: it was *offered*. The question disputed by anthropologists, whether the original idea was that of *communion* or that of *gift*, does not here arise, for no one, as far as I know, has propounded the hypothesis that the animal killed itself, or offered itself to God or gods. If the animal to be slain could have been consulted beforehand it may be presumed that it would not have agreed to its death: in other words, while des-

tined to be a 'sacrifice,' it would have firmly repudiated the desire for *self*-sacrifice. The whole cultus of 'sacrifice' was at the opposite pole from our modern notion of 'self-sacrifice.' In 'sacrifice' there is an *unwilling* victim: in 'self-sacrifice' there is the *willing* self-giver. I confess myself unable to perceive any religious value in this essential idea of the sacrificial cultus. And I approach the Gospels with the idea that a notion which is morally abhorrent to myself must have been not less so to our Lord.

A second essential idea in all sacrificial cultus is that the 'sacrifice' in some way — the precise way need not now be discussed — *influenced* God or gods. Again it matters not whether the *gift* or the *communion* theory, or a combination of both, be accepted by us: what matters is that the sacrificer believed that the slaying of the animal, or the eating of the slain animal, somehow influenced the mind or attitude of the Divine Being or beings. With the gradual development of ethical and spiritual ideas of God it would, of course, be denied that the slain animal *of itself* was believed to influence the Deity, the customary apologia being that it was the *motive* of the offerer that mattered. Nevertheless, the unwillingly slain animal remained an essential element in the sacrificial rite. The motive, the desire, the will, the thought of the worshipper could not, it was still maintained, effect what the 'sacrifice' could effect. Essential, therefore, to the idea of 'sacrifice' as such was the notion that it itself had some efficacious action upon the Deity. I confess myself, again, unable to perceive any religious value in this essential idea of the sacrificial cultus. And, again, I approach the Gospels with the idea that a notion which is so morally and spiritually abhorrent to myself could not have been less so to our Lord. I have, further, the ineradicable idea that I owe it to Jesus more than to any other teacher that I have this two-fold moral and spiritual abhorrence. I could no more find religious profit in taking part in a sacrificial rite than I could at a fox-hunt. Further, I find my own ineradicable conviction supported, indeed vindicated, by the fact that no single Christian I have ever conversed with on this subject would tolerate the resuscitation of the sacrificial cultus. In other words, the universal Christian consciousness has the same abhorrence for 'sacrifice' as I myself have. Exceptions that might be instanced among recently 'Christianised' savage

tribes may not, I think, be regarded as invalidating this conclusion.

We have to look now to the Gospels to find our Lord's attitude to a system which had as integral to it these two conceptions from which Christian humanity has long turned away, and to which it will never return unless our Christian heritage should be completely lost.

Our Lord's mind in reference to the sacrificial system, as in reference to any other practice or belief, can only be securely understood in *the light of His positive teaching*. Every student of the Gospels knows that there are but a few references to sacrifice: from these it is not possible to reach any convinced and convincing conclusion as to the mind of Jesus. We shall not therefore seek to read into such references as *Matt.* v, 23, *Mk.* i, 44, *Matt.* xii, 5, *Lk.* xvii, 14, *Matt.* xxiii, 18*f.* our own conclusions. Nor shall we build upon the fact that only in infancy (*Lk.* ii, 22-24) is Jesus recorded as have been present at a sacrifice, though the silence is not insignificant. What matters is the positive teaching of Jesus.

Here I must, in the interests of brevity, limit myself to a few direct statements, none of them, as far as I believe, controversial. Jesus taught that *holiness* is moral and spiritual, and not physical. Goodness belongs, not to things, but to motives, to thoughts, to deeds. It is out of the heart that evil proceeds. 'There is nothing from without the man that going into him can defile him' (*Mk.* vii, 15). The profound teaching of this passage in *Mark* has been as little generally understood by Christ's later disciples as by His first. In our pedagogic desire to emphasize that times, places, things have ethical and spiritual value, we forget to emphasize what Jesus Himself taught, namely, that no *thing* can confer goodness, as no *thing* can confer badness. The evil heart of man is not to be changed by the eating of any kind of physical food — whether it be the flesh of certain 'sacred' animals or portions of 'consecrated' bread. I ask my readers to apply this teaching of Jesus not only to the idea that the slaying or the eating of the unwilling victim of the altar cleanses his heart or gives him 'communion' with the Divine Father, but to all kindred ideas. It is the deepening of the sense of sin, the recognition of what it really is—'against Thee, Thee only have I sinned'—that renders all 'sacrifice' impossible.

Pervading all the teaching of Jesus was His condemnation of exclusive claims of Pharisees and Priests. Matthew records that Jesus twice cited the words of the prophet Hosea. 'Go ye and learn what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' was His answer to those who complained that He ate with publicans and sinners (*Mt.* ix, 13). The answer of Jesus to those who complained of His attitude to the Sabbath was : 'Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath day the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are guiltless? But I say unto you, that a greater thing than the temple is here. But if ye had known what this meaneth, I desire mercy, and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless' (*Mt.* xii. 5-7). Jesus says in effect : *According to your own rules the Temple service takes precedence of the Sabbath, but the Kingdom of God incarnate in my Person and Message takes precedence of the Temple and its rites. The prophet Hosea had himself perceived the higher obligations of the Divine Kingdom when he said, I desire mercy and not sacrifice.*

The incident usually known as 'the cleansing of the Temple' has clearly an important bearing on the question before us, but cannot be here discussed at length. The prophetic zeal manifest is in significant contrast to the worldly-wise discretion and tepidity which characterizes the ecclesiastical attitude to the abuses and perversions of Christian truth and practice. The Johannine evangelist associates the word of Jesus about the destruction of the Temple with this incident, and the association I believe to be significant (see *Jn.* ii, 13-22). The enigmatic utterance of our Lord about 'the destruction of the Temple' was, it will be remembered, used against Him at His trial (*Mk.* xiv, 58 ; xv, 29 ; *Mt.* xxvi, 61 ; xxvii, 40). Jesus, I suggest, did not say that He would destroy the Temple. He declares that all the tendencies revealed before Him necessarily destroy it. It is then that it becomes unto them 'desolate' (*Mt.* xxiii, 38). Jesus, Himself the very Shekinah (Tabernacle) of God, knew that He was called to reveal to men wherein true worship of the Father consisted. If, then, this 'temple' be destroyed, as it was being destroyed, another 'temple' was being raised by Him in the hearts and minds of men. This is a temple 'not made with hands.' Jesus, as we see from *Acts* vi, was regarded by Stephen as in the suc-

cession of the prophets whose concern was with the inward realization of the Divine presence, the worship of Him in spirit and in truth.

That Jesus was in the line of the prophets of the Old Testament as far as His attitude to the sacrificial system is concerned is to my own mind clear. Those who discuss earnestly whether the prophets, or Jesus Himself, were 'total abolitionists,' or only 'reformers,' are engaged, as it seems to me, on a false question. We should ask, not, Did they seek to abolish or to reform a system? but, What does their positive teaching *involve* for the system? We have to 'go and learn' what their attitude really means, not to use their utterances to buttress preconceived theories of the 'necessity' of a sacrificial system or of a 'divinely-instituted method of revealing the need for the expiation or propitiation of sin.' The sacrificial system has to be seen against the background of the central emphasis, the positive teaching, of the men, or Man, of God. When the prophetic psalmist says, 'For Thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would I give it: Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise,' we do not need to *argue* about what he means to say: we *know*. And in the light of that knowledge the false conceptions both of the nature of God and of human sin involved in the sacrificial system retreat into the night. And when the false ideas associated with the system depart, the system itself is relinquished: and it is relinquished, not because man loses his sense of sin, but because he comes to see what sin really is, and to have a truer understanding of the nature of God and of His demands.

Germane, therefore, to the attitude of our Lord to the sacrificial system is *His teaching on Forgiveness and its means*. Here again there is a theme for a book. Suffice it to say but a few things. Forgiveness to our Lord is not conceived in terms of remitting a penalty, but in terms of restoring a personal relationship. Sin is no third party separating man from God. It is the rebellion of man against the will of God. For that reason the conditions of restoration are moral and spiritual, not speculative and abstract. Jesus did not inquire — like so many theological thinkers — what must be done about an abstract entity,

'Sin,' before the Divine Father could bestow His grace: He taught that man must be changed in mind towards God and his fellows, and that then he would be the recipient of the ever-offered Divine grace. This change is seen in those who forgive others as freely as God forgives us: indeed, we only receive the Divine forgiveness in so far as we ourselves forgive those who have wronged us. All this stands out so clearly in the Gospels that its presence can only be ignored or evaded by those who have closed the eyes of the mind. The complete absence of the notions of penalty, propitiation, substitution, or expiation from the teaching of Jesus on what forgiveness means and how it is obtained is one of the most patent facts in the Gospels. The conceptions integral to the sacrificial cultus not only have no place in this teaching but are rendered impossible by it.

What, then, about the 'Passion sayings' of Jesus? Is there anything in them to suggest that Jesus changed His mind about the meaning, and conditions, of the Divine forgiveness—that while both in His personal service for men and in His teaching no trace of the ideas integral to 'sacrifice' can be found (indeed, that their presence is rendered impossible), such ideas may have found expression when He came to confront the 'necessity' of His death? It is impossible here to seek to expound these utterances at length; but I should wish to express my own judgment in the words of Dr. Oesterley in his recent book, *Sacrifices in Ancient Israel*, when he declares that there is 'not the faintest trace' of the expiatory, or the propitiatory, idea in any of these utterances. In the 'ransom' passage—so largely responsible, through myopic exegesis, for a theory that perverted Christian truth for a thousand years, and which, as I cannot but feel, still perverts it, though in a worthier context of ideas—Jesus declares the faith which possessed Him when death loomed before Him in the way He was unfalteringly treading. That faith was no theory of a propitiatory, or of an expiatory, death: it was no hypothesis that His Divine Father *required* Him as a sacrificial victim, or that His sufferings were 'an act of requital.' Jesus neither changed His conception of God nor of the nature of sin when He confronted the 'necessity' of death. He *accepted* death: He did not *escape* it, as He might have done had He been willing to repudiate what He had always been teaching

about the nature of God and about the nature of sin. And having *accepted* it, His *faith*—not His *theory*—declared that it would be for the moral and spiritual *deliverance* of many (*Mk.* x, 45; *Mt.* xx, 28). Imminent death did not *change* His view of the essential nature of the Messianic mission : it was included within that mission. His view of His death, as of His life, was founded on that knowledge of the Divine Father and of His will for men which had been the theme of all His teaching. He views His sufferings, as He viewed the whole of His life, as *vicarious*. But the adjective 'vicarious' does not mean one thing when His life and teaching are in our view, and another thing when His death is in our view. He did not think His death—willingly accepted and therefore *self*-sacrificial—of itself made it possible for His Divine Father to do what otherwise had been impossible : in other words, He did not *deny* the God whose nature He had always been declaring. None of the references, direct or indirect, to the Suffering Servant of *Isaiah* liii by our Lord either requires or, as I believe, permits a propitiatory or an expiatory interpretation. It cannot be too emphatically declared that a life of completely vicarious service, in allegiance to the Divine will, culminating in willingly-borne mortal sufferings imposed by the evil of men is one thing : a death, substitutionary, expiatory, or penal is quite another. And they are quite other because they involve different conceptions of the nature of God.

Christian thought has baptized such a word as 'sacrifice'—redolent as it is with conceptions we would fain leave behind, had we but the faith and the courage—to nobler conceptions and purposes. The unwilling victim is replaced by the willing self-giver. The primitive conception of a deity influenced in man's favour by external offering is replaced by that of the one Divine Father of all, Self-manifest in Jesus Christ, ever seeking by His Spirit to bring men to the obedience of sons. The 'sacrifice' of Jesus did not change God : it expressed God. If, therefore, we continue to use the word, is it not our bounden duty to free it of all its pagan associations?

THE PROBLEM OF 'REORGANIZATION' IN THE DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH

The Rev. C. J. Bleeker, D.D.

LAST summer the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church made a decision of far-reaching importance. After ample consideration it rejected a series of proposals to 'reorganize' the Church. Though Church-politics, as all political events, often have their surprising turns, it was not very risky in this instance to predict the result. For it had already become evident that the majority of the Church people was against these proposals. Last spring the so-called 'Classes,' local groups of parishes with legislative power, held their usual annual assemblies. Stormy months had preceded. Quite a stream of articles, pamphlets, discussions and meetings had stirred the quiet church life of Holland to a whirlpool of unrest and animosity. Those who defended the said proposals propagated them as the sole salvation of the Church from ruin, and tried to bring people to the conviction that the Church as a whole was longing for this re-shaping of its inner and outer structure. The opponents, especially the Liberals, made a strong counter-attack and won the victory. The said classes, for whose official 'considerations' on all legislative proposals the Synod is bound to ask, by a great majority passed a negative verdict on this matter. The reason was that this report on reorganization had a confessionalistic character. The synodal decision gave Modernism in the Dutch Reformed Church a somewhat narrow escape. This rejection of the said proposals does not mean that people in general dislike reorganization of the Church. On the contrary, there is in all church parties a strong feeling that the Church needs to be rebuilt. Therefore the Synod has charged its executive committee to study the whole problem anew with the assistance of the ecclesiastical professors from the different universities. Thereby an age-long struggle has come into a new period. Nobody can foresee what the future will bring. At any rate Modernism has a new chance to make its voice heard.

No one, especially no foreigner, can understand the true purpose of this struggle without considering the historical back-

ground. Let me try to give a rough sketch of this.

Different influences fostered the Reformation in Holland. Luther's strong personality certainly appealed to the Dutch mind; but the visible influence of Lutheranism in Holland is small and nowadays concentrated in tiny Lutheran churches. Holland came under the sway of Calvinism, which through France and Belgium found its way to the 'low lands near the sea.' This type of Reformed Faith, with its stern activity and precise dogmatic system, seemed to be congenial to a great part of the Dutch people. Fearless and fanatical presbyters were its exponents. These men founded the Dutch Reformed Church in precarious circumstances during the war with Spain. But they never won the sympathy of the whole people. There is something in the temper of the Dutch which made them even abhor the hard, logical consistency of rigid Calvinism. We have only to look at the old Flemish pictures, displaying the natural gaiety of the country-people, to understand that the hard, puritanical spirit of Calvinism found its resistance in the people themselves. There is also another force, of more spiritual character, to be taken into account. Holland had something of a Reformation of its own before Calvinism came on the stage. In our country lived the famous Erasmus, the exponent of a Biblical Humanism, who wished to reform the Church along the lines of tolerance, liberty and practical application of the commandments of the Gospel. There was a succession of persons, working in his spirit, representatives of a Reformation which may be called native, or home-born. They can be found in the ranks of that typical broad-minded and far-seeing magistracy which reigned during the Dutch Republic of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. They had to bear martyrdom in the case of the Remonstrants who fought against the dogma of Predestination and who were condemned at the famous Synod at Dort in 1681. A church historian of our day has called them 'the Flexibles,' whereas the Calvinists might be entitled 'the Precisionists.' These two parties have contended with each other during centuries, and even to-day their respective descendants find it very hard to come into harmony and real fellowship.

Modern history has given a new turn to this tension. To understand this new development it is essential to realize that the Dutch Reformed Church is a presbyterian type in which

the right preaching of the Gospel and orthodox creeds mean more than worship. Its liturgy is rather poor. All stress is laid on the sermon. During centuries church people have been educated to judge the orthodoxy of the sermon. It is often said that every Dutchman is a theologian.

The nineteenth century gave rise to Liberalism and Modernism, which have their roots in the Renaissance and the Humanism of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but which got their typical form in modern times. These currents also penetrated the Churches. People rejected all dogmas and freed themselves from confessional bonds. It is not necessary to give a lengthy description of this well-known development. In Holland a very radical Liberalism won an easy victory in great parts of the Church, but was later supplanted by a resurgent orthodoxy. Meanwhile this former and sometimes shallow Liberalism was replaced by what we may rightly call a religious Modernism, which is intent on the great task of re-discovering and re-stating the eternal values of the Gospel and the old Creeds.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century a group of Dutch Churchmen fiercely opposed to Modernism left the National Church and founded their own 'Reformed' Churches. Other traditionalist groups decided to stay in the Church and to fight for 'reorganization.' This war-cry has resounded in our Church during a long century. The policy of these people is crushed—perhaps for ever—by the decision of the Synod mentioned above.

They who stand for 'reorganization' have strong objections against the present church-order, which in its fundamental parts is a creation of King William the First. To him our Church is greatly indebted, for in the days of ecclesiastical chaos after the Napoleonic period he set our Church in order. But the 'Confessionals' do not acknowledge this church-order, which in their opinion, by its synodal character, deprives the Church from taking any valid decision in matters of Creed and Confession. As a matter of fact the traditional Confessions of our Church —the Belgian Confessions, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Articles against the Remonstrants—have no binding power. Church members are confirmed and ministers are admitted on the affirmation of a set of Confessional questions which, in the case of the first, can even be answered 'in spirit and in substance.' This Confessional freedom is a stumbling-stone to all

who are afraid of heresy. They stand for a Church which has a uniform Confession. In their case this often would mean a re-enactment of the old Creeds, which could be used to exercise discipline on all kinds of dissenters. Thus the main issue in our Church is the question of the value and the function of a Confession in general and of the historical Creeds in particular. There is a common agreement, also, among the Modernists that a Church should have a Confession and that the historical Creeds of our Church cannot be discarded. But many people are afraid of a 'Confessional' Church, in the bad sense of the word, which forces the literal acceptance of the Creeds upon its members.

In reality the situation is more complex than can be sketched in a short article. There are different currents, which are partly friendly and which partly oppose each other. The ideal of the so-called 'Confessionals' is the 'restoration' of the Church according to the church order of the seventeenth century. There is also a middle party, liberal in character, known as 'ethical' orthodoxy. This stands for 'reconstruction' of the Church, *i.e.* adaptation of church life to the needs of modern society in the oecumenical spirit. They received the support of the right wing of the Modernists up to the moment when it became quite clear that the co-operation of these two orthodox parties would mean the reconfessionalizing of the Church and the end of Modernism. Then the Modernists, together with a part of the traditionalist wing, rejected the said proposals.

This was no deed of negativism, as is often contended. It sprang out of a true love for the Church and a clear insight that a Confessional Church would totally lose its grip on an already partly de-Christianized population. In this world situation there is need for a missionary spirit and not for fundamentalism. But there is a common feeling that the rejected proposals contain certain ideas which would help our Church to a real revival. It is hoped that the Synod will initiate a policy of reorganization on these lines. The Modernists are firmly resolved to play an active and positive part in the forthcoming discussions and negotiations. They have drafted a constructive programme and have announced their full willingness to help to make our old beloved Dutch Reformed Church into a worthy member of the *Una Sancta.*

CHURCH AND STATE*

By Sir Cyril Norwood, President of St. John's College, Oxford.

I HAVE two remarks which I should like to make at the outset and which I should like my hearers to keep always in mind: the first is that I am speaking as a layman, and the second is that I am expressing my own personal point of view, and am not propounding an official policy. The problem which we are asked to consider to-night can be treated in two ways, on the narrower ground of the relation of the Church of England to the State, and on the wider ground of the relation of God to Caesar, of Christianity to the modern State. It is my belief that in the narrower form, so far as the laity of this country is concerned, the problem is as dead as cold mutton, or, if I may put it more politely, it is in a state of suspended animation. But in its wider form it is very much alive; indeed, there is nothing in my opinion which more vitally affects the future destiny of humanity. The one problem is parochial in comparison to the other, for the other affects the whole world.

Let us take the narrower issue of the Church of England first. The Church is ultimately controlled by the House of Commons, whose members may be of any religion or none, may be Roman Catholics and Jews, may be infidels and heretics: the Bishops are appointed by the Prime Minister, who again may be of any religious persuasion or none. This is, it is urged, illogical and unjustifiable, and on the grounds of strict logic I should agree. I shall not attempt to justify it theoretically, but only say that in practice it works, and the majority of the laity of the nation feel, I am sure, that it is a guarantee of tolerance, and maintains freedom for different schools of thought to exist. They have an instinct that if the national Church were given the complete right of self-determination in all things, in the appointment of bishops and the determination of its rites and ceremonies, this would lead directly to majority rule, and the

* An address delivered in the Caxton Hall, Westminster, on Oct. 18, 1938, at a Public Meeting of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

minority would no longer enjoy the tolerance and freedom which they now possess. And so, for instance, in that great issue of Prayer Book revision, I was personally in favour of allowing the alternative office of Holy Communion, though I did not like it, simply on the ground that the Church of England, if it is to be national, ought to go to the extreme limits of comprehension. But there was no real backing in the ranks of the nation in favour of the change: most people did not want any alteration in the Communion Service, and still less did they like the Reservation of the Sacrament, so we had the paradoxical result that the House of Commons interpreted the national mind more truly than the bishops and clergy who were behind these proposals. There was nothing real, determined, and nation-wide supporting them: it is even possible that the House of Commons that day saved the whole Church from entering upon a process which would have left it broken into a group of sects.

What the majority of laymen do feel is rather that the Church of England, if it is to be national, wants at the moment, not more freedom, but more discipline, and that, in some carefully guarded way, courts with powers of control should be brought into existence in each diocese with authority to restrain wild adventures of individuals which convert the parish church, which exists for all members of the Church of England, into a display ground for narrow extremists, and also to deal more quickly and more surely with scandalous incumbents. I repeat that this method should be carefully guarded, for we desire in a national Church neither majority tyranny nor episcopal tyranny, and the Church owes much gain, as well as considerable loss, to the freedom and independence which individual incumbents enjoy. I am, however, only trying to report on lay opinion as I know it, and I will content myself with saying that the indiscipline of the clergy is an offence to it, and makes the prospect of allowing complete self-government very unattractive. And just in the same way even democrats think popular election of bishops likely to bring much evil with it, and reports from overseas go to confirm that view. The Prime Minister acting independently after hearing the best and the most responsible advice is likely to give the Church better governors than any system of popular election would do.

But perhaps we have spent long enough on this issue in view of the much greater importance of wider questions. It is hardly necessary for me to point out that the conception of the State in the modern world is changing rapidly, and in some countries its claims have enlarged themselves so much that there is no room for the Church at all. Let us come to this later. In the nineteenth century it was a fairly widely accepted idea of Liberalism that there should be a free Church in a free State, and that this was both desirable and possible. A sharp distinction was drawn between the spiritual and the secular, and so long as the State retained control of all public education, and of all temporal power, it was right that it should leave the spiritual sphere to the Church, which meant in effect a notice to the Church to keep out of politics. This was a natural view in the nineteenth century, and indeed it was forced upon the laity by the conflicting intolerance of rival sects and denominations. It was inevitable that this theory should be adopted, for instance, in the United States and in the British Dominions. But it does not work really well. For one thing the State tends to become more and more secular and materialistic in outlook, and the Churches themselves become secularized. It has particularly unfortunate results in education, where again the Liberal slogan has been that State education shall be free, compulsory and secular. But an education which is entirely secular is not an education at all in the true sense of the term: it has no vitamins; it is mainly the imparting of certain information, the inculcation of certain skill. It gives no help towards the problems of how to live one's life: it imparts no standards and no values. And so wherever you find that this system has been in force for any length of time, you find a sense that education is sterile, and that there is something wrong with it. There is something which religion, that is the Church, has to contribute that is essential. It seems to me to be impossible to make this clear cut between the material and the spiritual: they are everywhere intermixed, as they are in our own persons. It is particularly in the field of education that this partnership of Church and State must be effective, and the different Christian bodies of a country should combine to secure that definite religious teaching on an agreed syllabus should be given to all children save where a parent may conscientiously

object: and further, this teaching should be given under such conditions as to give it the reality and the importance which it can fairly claim.

So that, dismissing this sharp distinction between Church and State, I fall back on what Mandell Creighton said long ago. He asserted that to his mind Church and State are not contradictory things, but are simply the nation looked at from different points of view. The nation looked at from the secular side is the State, looked at from the religious side it is the Church, and separation between the two is impossible. And this is true. To me the Holy Catholic Church is the congregation of all who profess and call themselves Christians, but it is a pattern laid up in the heavens; it does not exist in visible form upon the earth. The Holy Catholic Church is the Church of the old Roman Empire, its faithful counterpart: the material side of that Empire with all its forms has passed away, but not so the Church. The Church of England likewise is the English nation on its spiritual side, and to me all communities of English Christians of whatever denomination ought to be part of the Christian Church of England, representing, I say again, the English nation on its spiritual side. Each part should have freedom to worship in its own way, but there should be inter-communion between them, and a fellowship which shall show itself above all in making Christian foundations the basis of national education.

You may say that I am linking the Church to the nation, and my answer is that as a practical man I cannot do otherwise. God made the nations of the earth, and that is the condition of our lives. There is nothing contrary to the Catholic ideal, as I conceive it, in a union of national churches, and each nation has its contribution to make, its own interpretation of the way of Christ. But we are passing through days of great difficulty and danger, in which the idea of nationality, of national individuality, and of national destiny are playing a very hazardous part. And to this is added a theory of the State, both in Germany and in Italy, which to me at any rate makes the Church unreal, since the State is substituted for God. If the State claims the right to define God, as in effect it does in Germany, as first a German, and second a Nazi German, and provides the amenities of the concentration camp for those who think differently, then there exists

no longer a Church in the sense in which we are speaking of it, and Pastor Niemöller, whether we are in sympathy with his school of Christian thought or not, is fighting the battle of all Christians. Equally in Italy, though there may be on the surface a *concordat*, and Mussolini may claim that Fascism is an ethical system without a theology, equally there it is clear that the position of the Roman Catholic Church becomes more and more difficult, and that the State is more and more taking from the Church what properly belongs to it.

What of the Communist solution? We need not do more than glance at the position in Russia, where the State has destroyed the Church or driven it far underground. In a community which lays down as a primary dogma that there are no values at all save the material, it is clear that there is nothing to talk about: if it succeeds, then Christianity perishes, and there can be no Church.

Let us come back to Bishop Creighton's conception, which to me is the most fruitful way of envisaging the whole problem. The Church is the nation on its religious side, and its task is to inspire the State, as when its old task of looking after the poor, and the needy, and the sick is taken over by a great code of social legislation, all of which was inspired by Christianity. Its direct duty is to its individual members: its province is the cure of souls. But it is not itself a department of the State, and it cannot be made the instrument of a Government policy. It derives its inspiration from a higher source, but it is vigorous and alive, and it closely associates itself with the national life in all its manifestations. We cannot, when all is said and done, get any further in this matter, or be more precise, than our Lord on the famous occasion of the tribute money when He said, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' The frontier between the two is not and cannot be a clear frontier, and moreover from age to age between Church and State it tends to change. But we all know in our own lives that the two realms exist, even though we cannot define the frontiers.

I borrow another simple metaphor made very familiar to us by the same simple teaching. The business of the Church is to act as leaven, to leaven the lump, and this it will inevitably suc-

ceed in doing if it is content to teach men and women to follow Christ. In carrying out that duty it must be entirely free. It is idle to pretend that the State has not assumed forms so threatening that the Church is faced in great countries with spiritual captivity, or even with persecution to death. It is not so here as yet, though materialism has never had so strong a hold, and the attacks on Christianity, and in particular on the Christian Church, have never been more open. The world is adrift, unhappy, frightened, and hostile, and as one looks at the Christian Church the world over one thinks instinctively of the words at the end of the 16th chapter of St. *John*:

> 'Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; yet I am not alone because the Father is with me. These things I have spoken unto you that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.'

SACRAMENTAL SYMBOLISM

By Rev. E. P. Boys-Smith, M.A.

NONE will deny that sacraments are symbols, though the implications may be disputed. My aim is to fix attention on a distinction in the symbolism of the Christian sacraments which I believe to be of high importance. Had it been clearly drawn and always held, some parts of the Doctrinal Report might have been simpler, and more convincing; and a good deal in traditional theology less contentious and of more value for real religion.

To get rid of verbal ambiguity let me first distinguish between a symbol and an emblem. An emblem is a sign of something other than itself, just as a simile is a figure of language which expresses a parallel, not an identification. But a symbol is a sign which embodies what it signifies, just as a metaphor in speech identifies the figure with the meaning beyond it. 'Speech is silvern, but silence golden'—that is metaphor, the metals serving as symbols: but 'Rhetoric glitters like glass'—that uses glass as an emblem, the simile suggesting a point of resem-

blance only in two separate things. Sacraments are not emblems, but symbols they are; being themselves, they are signs of something beyond themselves, to which they owe their value.

Now symbols are of two kinds which must be distinguished. They are either significant *things*, or significant *acts*. A coat of arms, *e.g.* is a family symbol, as a crest may be of a regiment or a club. If any use them who are not members of the family, club, or regiment, they have no meaning at all. These then are *things* which symbolise kinship or membership. On the other hand, when the King confers knighthood, the accolade is an *action* which is symbolic; the sword used is not significant, but the blow accompanying command.

Sometimes, however, the thing and the act are so closely associated that the distinction, though always real, may be missed unless care is taken. Let two illustrations make this clear. In a marriage the symbols are 'the giving and receiving of a ring, and the joining of hands,' which both constitute and declare the troth pledged mutually which makes the marriage. The symbols are the acts; not the ring, nor the hands, but the giving and receiving of the one, and the joining of the others. Yet in after years during which the ring is worn, it is itself a symbol of the married state which continues, though it was not of its origination. In the performance of a marriage the symbol is an *act*, in the married condition the symbol is a *thing*. Again, when a country annexes another country, or a ship captures an enemy ship, the flag of the one is hoisted to fly over the other. The flag has all along been a symbol of the national allegiance for the dominant country, or its ship, a *thing* significant of nationality. But the flag is not the symbol of annexation or capture, that is the hoisting of it for the first time, which signifies the acquirement of a new allegiance and nationality, and here the symbol is an *act*. Thereafter the flag may be flown daily, and become for the acquired country or captured ship a symbolic *thing* as it was all along for the captor. To some minds it may seem that the distinction here drawn is a fine one; it is nevertheless a real one, and may become in some cases one of great importance. If accurate thinking is required it must not be ignored or confused. And in the theological consideration of the sacraments accurate thinking *is* required. What then are

the symbols in Christian Baptism and Communion? Are they acts, or things? My contention is that they are *acts* and are not *things*.

In Baptism the symbol is not water, but bathing in water (conjoined of course with confession of the Name of God). The symbolic act admits of more aspects than one. St. Paul, *e.g.* led by the suggestive immersion and re-emergence, speaks of being buried in baptism into death, and raised again with Christ into new life;[1] but at other times, since bathing cleanses, he speaks of Christ cleansing the Church by the washing of water with the word.[2] Always it is the action of bathing, not the water itself which is the symbol; and the very name of the sacrament shews this. βάπτισμα originates from the verb βαπτίζω and expresses the result of doing what the verb means. In Christian history this has always been understood. The water was not blest to begin with, rivers often being used, nor has it been always in later times. When the catechism asks, 'What is the outward visible sign or form in baptism?' the answer is, 'Water wherein the person is baptized,' the act being specified, as is also the medium used.

In the other Christian sacrament the like is true. In the Lord's Supper the symbols are not the bread and the wine, which are the things consumed, but the acts of eating the bread and drinking the wine together. This appears in one of the earliest names given to the sacrament, and found in the New Testament, *viz.* 'the breaking of the bread'[3]; and in the earliest record extant St. Paul emphasizes this, 'we all partake of the one bread.'[4] All investigation into the origin of this sacrament goes to shew that it springs from two roots in the life and teaching of Jesus. Whether or not He instituted and commanded the sacrament need not here be asked, for if not, it still goes back to the earliest days and was believed to be in accord with his practice and purpose. In both its sources the symbolism is the same. (1) In part it grew out of the meals together in which Jesus, following custom, blest the food which His disciples shared with Him. These were naturally occasions of close association and

[1] Rom. vi, 4.
[2] Eph. v, 26; I Cor. vi, 11.
[3] Ac. ii, 42, 46.
[4] I Cor. x, 17.

heightened intimacy, which stood out as sacred in later remembrance, and may be said to have culminated in the feeding of the five thousand, and the supper at Emmaus. (2) In part it grew out of the supper on the eve of the crucifixion, when the minds of Jesus and His disciples were full of the impending Passover, when He realized that His self-sacrifice would be consummated in death. He used the ideas and the forms of the ancient sacrifice to draw His disciples closer to Himself and lead them to share in His own consecration and self-sacrifice. In the Passover (as in most of the more solemn sacrifices, at least originally), the sacrifice consisted in slaying the lamb whose life was offered to God in the temple, and then eating together at home its flesh by the family or household for which it was offered. The household became participant in the sacrifice by so eating. Jesus filled the place of the lamb whose life was offered to God, His followers eat together the bread which fills the place of His body. This sacrament is thus the latter half of a sacrifice, of which the former half is Christ's offering once for all on the Cross. In it we gather as the Family of God to partake in Christ's consecration and follow His lead as the Pioneer and Perfecter of Faith,[5] proclaiming His death 'till he come.'[6] This is what, according to the Fourth Gospel, He prayed for at the time: 'For their sakes I consecrate myself, that they may themselves also be consecrated in truth.'[7] And this is what the Te Deum triumphantly confesses: 'When thou hadst overcome the sting of death, thou didst open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers.'

So far then as this sacrament derives its symbolism from the meals which Jesus often had eaten with disciples about Him, it is plain that the *things* eaten mattered not, but the *action* of eating together. Bread and wine were not always the food, though perhaps often. By the lake it was 'five barley loaves and a few small fishes'; on a last occasion 'a piece of a broiled fish' [and a honey-comb]' (Lk. xxiv, 42). The fellowship in eating was the symbol. So far as the Last Supper is the starting point, the flesh of the lamb was eaten, but the Paschal Law stressed the eating under pain of being cut off from Israel, and on this

[5] Heb. xii, 2. [6] I Cor. xi, 26. [7] Joh. xvii, 19.

the stress is laid by Jesus' spoken words. These are differently reported, but the *verbs* always predominate. 'Take, eat . . . Drink ye all . . .' (Mt.); 'Take ye . . . and all drank . . .' (Mk.); 'This do . . .' (Lk.). Nor should it be forgotten that in the original Aramaic the 'is' occurring twice was probably unexpressed. Here too it is the action rather than the thing which made the symbol.

Mention may well be made of what the 25th Article lays down: 'Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace . . .' The contrast here is what I marked to begin with between emblems which sacraments are not, and symbols which they are, though old-fashioned terms are employed; but within it the phrase 'effectual signs' has importance. It means of course signs which effect something. This an emblem or token does not, but a symbol may, though not all symbols do. Which do? Those which are acts, not those which are things. Symbolic things are static, and witness to some existent beyond themselves; symbolic actions are dynamic, and give an impulse the momentum of which is carried on into the unseen. Both may be of high value and may be 'sure witnesses,' but it is the latter which effect something, and are 'effectual signs.' Such are the symbols in the Christian sacraments.

If this distinction had always been recognized and borne in mind the history of the Church would have been happier, and the sacrament intended to be a bond of unity would not have become instead a focus of controversy and opposition. In the early Church the right point of view was instinctively taken, and the sacrament was therefore a corporate action for all. But from the fourth century the level of spiritual life was lowered all through the dark ages, and the influence of pagan ideas and practices penetrated the Church. Ignorance was general, and the acceptance of materialistic and magical conceptions came naturally. Without express intention, and indeed unconsciously, the symbolism of the sacraments was found in the *things*, instead of in the *actions*. The water was regarded as the sign in baptism, and this was blest, as it was not at first, when

running water was preferred (*cf.* Didache VII); and 'holy water' was similarly used for aspergence at other times. In the Eucharist the bread and wine came to be considered the signs, instead of the eating and drinking of them. It followed that their signification was looked for in the body and blood of Christ, instead of in the giving of Himself — body and life-blood — a perfect offering to God, and an infinite gospel and invigoration for men. The New Testament points to the centre in a perfect will (Heb. x, 9-10) and a perfect love (Joh. iii, 16; xiii, 1; Gal. ii, 20; Eph. ii, 4-6; v, 2), which are activities, and just those in which the spiritual life in men is taken up into, and united with, the Spirit and Life of God, by the grace given in Christ.

The most fatal mistake was made when the focus of consecration was transferred from that of the believers gathered together with the Lord, to that of the material elements. The entire sacrament is an act of consecration; it symbolises Christ's own consecration of Himself, and conjoins in this those who by partaking consecrate themselves to the same service and devotion. And their power to consecrate themselves in truth is derived from His living presence and inspiration, which uplift them into the eternal world of spiritual reality, where they 'can do all things in Him that strengtheneth' them.[8] The consecration of the bread and wine is a much lesser matter, and consists in setting apart this food for sacred use. In the language of the Old Testament it thus becomes 'holy,' but in the Christian sense 'holiness' is ethical, and is only to be found in persons, whether God or His people, and in personal characteristics or activities. Kant had learnt in this school when he affirmed that 'there is nothing holy in the world except a holy will.' In the Fourth Gospel we listen to the Lord's voice in the first eucharistic intercession, and this is what He prays for those whom the Father has given Him out of the world: 'For their sakes I consecrate myself, that they themselves also may be consecrated in truth. Neither for them only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word, that they may all be one, even as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they also may be in us.'[9] If it is true that 'He ever liveth to make intercession for

[8] Phil. iv, 13.

[9] Joh. xvii, 19.

us,' it is no less true that the content of His intercession must ever be this; and the sacrament is a means by which the prayer is answered, bringing those believers who draw near in it, to enter into and share His own consecration, and find therein union with Him in the life of the eternal Father. There is no higher goal than that. But to focus the consecration on the bread and wine opened the way to conceptions of magic, and led to the worst abuses of sacerdotalism and non-communion in the sacrament, with superstitious practices like masses for the dead, paid for or purchased by legacy. These things could hardly have occurred, even in ignorant times, if it had been recognized that the symbols are not the material elements, but the acts of consuming them, where the emphasis of consecration falls on personal activities.

Much in Scholastic Theology which still burdens the Church as a tradition would then have been avoided, or have taken a different course. Theories of Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation would be without their presuppositions, and would have no relevance. Disputes between adherents of the Real Presence (in the narrow sense) and Receptionists would lose their acrimony as the issues would be differently conceived and stated. Charges of 'Christian Magic' because there cannot be spiritual change in a material thing would not be made, for if all recognized that the symbol is not the thing, no one would claim to make a spiritual change in the thing. Questions about the lawfulness or desirability of Reservation would become tractable, or even solve themselves, if it were allowed that the symbol is an act; for action cannot be 'reserved,' it is either done or not done, and if suspended is resumed by fresh action; and the abuse of calling the bread and wine themselves 'the sacrament' would cease. A great clarification of Theology might result, at least in some of its branches, if the erroneous view of what the sacramental symbols consist in, which came about insensibly in the earlier and was stereotpyed in the later Middle Ages, were corrected by returning to the true view found in the New Testament and in the earliest centuries of the Church. And that would certainly encourage and facilitate Christian Reunion, as it would also bring Theology into closer harmony with living and practical religion.

In illustration of this last contention, let me add a concluding consideration. The earliest document extant which describes or deals with this sacrament is St. Paul's First Epistle to Corinthians. He discusses it in two passages: x, 15-22; xi, 17-34, the first occasioned by abuses connected with idolatry, the second with selfish indulgence and irreverence. The first opens with the question, 'The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?' And he goes on to ask, 'Have not they which eat the sacrifices communion with the altar? . . . I would not that ye should have communion with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and of the table of demons.' The emphasis throughout is on communion. Where the bread or the wine are mentioned it is always in connexion with some action specified, the cup is blessed, the bread is broken, all partake of the bread, or drink of the cup, or partake of the table of the Lord. The *things* are never mentioned apart from action or given significance of themselves; and the *action* is always communion, or of the nature of communion with Christ, and in a secondary sense between believers. The second passage opens with the round statement about the gatherings of the Church in Corinth which were disgraced by selfishness and irreverence: 'When ye assemble yourselves together it is not to eat the Lord's supper, for in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper.' Here the apostle is shocked by the patent absence of communion, and all he goes on to say is calculated to bring out the significance of the sacrament in its salient aspect of communion with the Lord, and consequently with one another. In narrating what he had 'received of the Lord, and also delivered to them,' all the emphasis falls on what Jesus *did*, and bade His disciples *do*: He took bread, having given thanks broke it, and said 'This is my body which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of me . . . This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.' It is action being taken and action enjoined. And in the succeeding verses in the course of which the apostle mentions the bread and the cup three times it is never by themselves, but always eating of the one and drinking of the other, while finally he

speaks of eating and drinking alone without specifying what is eaten or drunk, though of course this is understood.

The aspect of communion which is thus uppermost in St. Paul's mind, is not the only aspect of the sacrament, and to some minds other aspects have seemed more obvious, but by spiritually-minded Christians it has always been deemed vital. To grasp the truth that the real symbolism consists in acts and not in things, leads on inevitably to the experience of communion. Whichever of the two origins out of which (by conjunction) this sacrament came into existence may be taken into account, the result is so far the same. A meal begun with blessing, in which the Lord and His disciples are drawn together and He dispenses to them sustenance which they share with Him, is most apt to symbolise the spiritual fact of holy communion with the unseen Lord, and the grace derived from Him. And the remembrance of 'the night in which He was betrayed' and braced Himself to love His own to the uttermost, and to do the Father's will 'even unto death, yea, the death of the cross,' must move believers to enter into His high purpose, and disowning self to share in some measure His perfect faith and consecration, to do which *is* holy communion and the grace of eternal life. So the act of eating and drinking with the living Lord, whether in sacred intercourse, or in participating thus in His supreme sacrifice, lends itself inevitably to become an 'effectual sign' by means of which loyal worshippers are enabled to affirm in all humility, 'I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me.'[10] Like the *sacramentum* of the legionary this is a pledge of allegiance by His followers to the Leader to whom they look; but it is much more than this, 'for if we have become united with Him by the likeness of His death, we shall also be united with Him by the likeness of His resurrection,'[11] and a window in heaven is opened, a way to eternal life.

[10] Gal. ii, 20.

[11] Rom. vi, 5.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE DOMINANT RELIGIOUS ISSUE*

This recent book of Canon Raven does not so much state a point of view as plead, and offer the basis, for a fresh and comprehensive enquiry into the truth. Certainly Dr. Raven writes as a pacifist who believes that 'from the Christian standpoint there is really no serious answer to the pacifist arguments' (p. 160). But he is devastatingly fair! He is more concerned to elucidate rival theories and to prevent their insight into truth being overlooked than to attempt any synthesis.

His chapter on 'War as the less of two evils' gives the arguments of those Christians who, while hating war and working for its disappearance, believe that the world as a whole is not yet ready for disarmament and that 'to refuse to resist aggression is to deprive justice both of sword and scales' (p. 119). This chapter was written before the recent Sudeten crisis, yet many will feel that the following words then received their most tragic illustration:

> 'It is at least probable that if it had not been for the wave of anti-militarism which made it impossible for our statesmen to rely upon public support in any adequate maintenance of British armaments, the obligations of the members of the League in the matter of Abyssinia would have been honoured; the principle of collective security, which for all the smaller nations is fundamental, would not have been brought into disrepute; the tragic destruction of the last native African autonomy would have been averted. . . . So long as there are nations which glorify war and look to it as the ultimate arbiter in human affairs, those of us who detest it have either to maintain peace by force of arms or allow them to fulfil their ambitions unrestrained' (p. 115).

The following chapters set out equally clearly the pacifist renunciation of war. Without denying the part which war has played in past history, the pacifist insists that the time has come for a definite advance to be made. He is prepared to face all of its risks, in the belief

> 'that love matters more than national prestige or independence or possessions; that love cannot be served by methods which contradict it, and that man is not so depraved as to be ultimately insensitive to its appeal' (p. 154).

To the argument that such an attitude widely adopted would invite invasion and expose his family and fellow men to carnage, he replies that

> 'War on a large scale would be a disaster immeasurably worse than any which pacifism could involve' (p. 157).

As one would expect from Dr. Raven, here is a perfectly logical attitude, clearly and logically worked out in all of its details. It is based fundamentally upon the conviction that

> 'the faith of Jesus is universally valid, that the Cross is the instrument

* *War and the Christian.* By C. E. Raven, D.D. (186 pp. Price 5/-. 1938.)

of salvation, that by it alone is the *koinonia* . . . realisable, that man is made for such community, that he can only attain it by using means consistent with his end, that war is a denial of those means, a frustration of that end. . . .' (p. 140).

Yet many readers will feel that the argument of these chapters is not a complete answer to the rival theory. If it sets out the Christian goal more clearly, it does not suggest such a practical plan of campaign as would solve all the difficulties. It does not seem, for example, an adequate answer to *Mein Kampf*.

But Dr. Raven will carry all with him in voicing the urgency of the question and in stressing the problem of war as 'the dominant moral and religious issue of the day' (p. 26). So long as the Church generally is unable to reach a common mind about it, not only will its influence upon public opinion be negligible, but it will be in danger of another and vital secession from its ranks—this time, of those who in pacifism have found a unifying loyalty which has transcended the lesser loyalties of their sects. Hence his appeal for a fresh enquiry into the truth:

> 'If preliminary enquiries into the exegetical, doctrinal and practical aspects of the question could provide a full statement of the essential data, and if then the Church would submit these data with the utmost seriousness to a group of responsible and generous-hearted leaders, a real measure of progress might be made' (p. 107).

J. P. Hodges.

A ROMANTIC ROMANIST *

In his introduction to the present volume Father Chaillet explains that it is a translation into French of Moehler's original book published in 1825. The translation has been made, he says, by Dom de Lilienfeld, so that the work of this German professor of Munich may be accessible to a large circle of readers. Moehler, we learn, was much influenced intellectually by Schleiermacher and Neander, but while he took from them scientific method he retained his own sense of tradition, characterised by careful reference to sources, clarity of exposition, and some historical perspective. This advocacy of an essential unity of spirit, doctrine, and episcopal order in the early Church will make an impression upon the uncritical reader. The more circumspect investigator will find two strands of treatment inextricably interwoven in the course of the survey. The first is an erudite use of historical materials and a degree of historical reconstruction. The second is what we may term mystical intuition, which enables the author to supplement or supplant the conclusions that come from his employment of historical science. Father Chaillet says that Moehler 'set himself to restore a vision of the Church which should be at once mystical and historical.' He means this for praise, but it is rather an apt summary of the facility with which the Professor, by means of 'mystic insight,' turns the situation of history

* *L'Unité dans l'Eglise.* By J. A. Moehler. Translated from the German by Dom André de Lilienfeld. Introduction by Pierre Chaillet, S.J. (Les Editions du Cerf. Unpriced. 1938.)

to square it with tradition. A typical instance is the case stated for the primacy of Rome:

> 'I hesitated for some time to think that the primacy of one Church could be at all a characteristic of a Catholic church. Organic unity seemed to be achieved by the union of the episcopate. It is also a fact that the history of the first three centuries of the Church is poor in material to prove the primacy against all doubts that we may entertain' (p. 217).

So far the historian. Yet meagre sources are the mystic's opportunities.

> 'But on examining the character of St. Peter as the Bible records it; in studying history and its undercurrents (*et ses profondeurs*), in looking into the organic life of the Church with a living insight (*de façon vivante*) I was obliged to admit the primacy of a single Church. In any perfect organization, as for instance in the universe, the parts are organized in such a way that we can see in each of them a prototype of the whole. This must be the case in the organisation we know as the Church' (p. 218).

In other words, the bishop's supremacy in his diocese points to the fact that he is a type of the one bishop who is supreme in the whole Church.

We need hardly say that Moehler wrote before the researches of Harnack, Hatch, Streeter and other scholars had established a diversity rather than a unity both of doctrine and order in the Church of the early centuries. The extent to which he has used records, except, of course, the 'Didache' is full of interest. He has covered ground familiar to later students, but, as we have said, not as a pure scientific historian. He accepts the episcopacy from Ignatius without noticing that this apostle of episcopacy is buttressing up a case for one form of order against other forms that were in the field. He overlooks Ignatius' silence about the Roman primacy. The actual cause of Moehler's 'mystic intuition' we take to be his Catholic view of truth. He believed that truth once and for all came to the Roman Church through the Holy Spirit. For this reason he describes heresy as 'a manifestation of the spirit of the world.' He has no conception of truth living through discussion. Similarly, even where history records diversity of order, he sees the episcopate as 'the essential function of unity.'

While we do not attach importance to the general conclusions of this volume we note with interest a point dealt with by Father Chaillet. He recalls that the climate of thought of Moehler's day was the reaction of the romantic movement from the age of reason in favour of history, nature, and life. That romanticism influenced the Church is evident to-day in a return to mediaeval customs and forms. Certain writers, like Montalembert and Chateaubriand, in the early nineteenth century did much to awaken the past of Christendom, and we incline to think of the present work as a product of the same romantic impulse which revived a sense of the value of the past. These romantics painted, as it were, a picture which subsequent students have enriched with clearer colours and a more exact perspective.

J. R. McCallum.

THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH*

'I have been giving a course of three lectures in Chicago, and they are going to be printed.' 'What is the book to be called?' 'I haven't given it a name yet.' 'Well, what is it about?' 'It's just a lot of things I have been thinking about Christianity and where it touches philosophy and theology and ethics and all that sort of thing.' 'Why not call it "Essays on Things in General"?' 'It's not quite as wide as that, because it does all hang round Christianity.' 'Then why not call it "Christianity and Thought?" ' 'Because Ethics is practice, or at least thought about practice.' 'I should call it "Christianity in Thought and Practice" then.' 'I dare say that might do, but it sounds rather big.' 'Oh, that's all right, they won't expect a three-volume treatise for half a crown.' This is an imaginary conversation to account for so small a book having so big a name: but all the same, it's a good half-crown's worth, as one would expect from the Archbishop of York. The reviewer has no intention of trying to summarise in one hundred words what Dr. Temple has put in ninety-four pages, or even of picking out the tit-bits. Those who want to find the tit-bits must read the whole book for themselves, and they won't be disappointed. Attention must however be drawn to the study of the meaning of human personality, which is specially important in view of present day needs.

In *Evangelism and the Laity* we have a book which has great thought and no mean learning behind it, but yet boldly presents Christianity as a gospel and not simply as the conclusion of an argument. Here is no disparagement of learning, or of the attempt to understand and explain the implications of the Faith. But the power of Christianity is seen in its presentation as a piece of good news which must be passed on:

> 'It is significant that in modern times we find ourselves most nearly in the atmosphere and setting of the New Testament when we are in those circles within the Church which are most clearly concerned either with the missionary work of the Church overseas or with the evangelistic work of the Church at home.'

We are told that 'the gospel must inevitably create fellowship as one of its primary and principal results,' and in accordance with this fact the work of evangelism is presented as one in which every member of the Christian fellowship must take part. The plea is made that Parochial Church Councils should take a leading part in evangelism, and not regard themselves as concerned only with finance and policy. To do this spiritual work means that the councillors must themselves be dedicated men and women, with experience (in themselves or through their study of others in life or in

* *Christianity in Thought and Practice.* By William Temple, Archbishop of York. (S.C.M. 1936. 2/6.)
Evangelism and the Laity. By H. A. Jones. (S.C.M. 1937. 2/6.)
The Church and the Challenge of To-day. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, Bishop of Derby. (Longmans. 1937. 4/6.)
The Sacraments and the Church. By Henry de Candole. (Mowbray. 1935. 2/6.)

reading) of the power of Christ to fulfil our needs. It will certainly be a great day for any parish when it is realised that membership of the Council is a spiritual office.

> 'If any reader puts down this book without a resolve to witness more courageously and more effectively for Christ, this book will have failed in its object so far as he is concerned.'

The author need have no fear: what he has written will certainly encourage many to witness more courageously, and show them how to do it more effectively.

The Church and the Challenge of To-day approaches the same subject of evangelism in what must of necessity be a narrower way, because the author is addressing one section of the Church, *viz.* the clergy, and thinking mainly of their part in the work. At the same time he realises that the people to be evangelised are to be reached, not directly by the clergy, but by the laity. The moral of this for the clergy is greater and not less attention to their sermons. The preacher's

> 'supreme object ought to be so to instruct the minds of the faithful laity, and at the same time to fire them with zeal, that they will, by the grace of God, be consumed with the desire on their own part to learn more, and to bear witness to others.'

When the author comes to the details of services he is in the difficult position of being a Bishop, and therefore feels more or less bound by the decision of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1929 as to the permitted deviations from the Prayer Book. Good as far as it went, that resolution was far too narrow, for it is perfectly obvious that many quite unobjectionable deviations were not allowed in the proposed Prayer Book of 1928. It is difficult, for instance, to find any justification for the Bishop's deprecation of announcing (before reading it) the Collect for the Day. Surely that is an educational item which in certain circumstances is useful, and should be left to the man on the spot to decide. It may be necessary, in the interests of loyalty to Church authority, to restrict for the moment the use of the pulpit to those who have been ordained in the Church of England or duly licensed to preach. But the Bishop would have had the support of a great part of his flock if he had said that this was only a temporary self-denial, and if he joined with those who would like to see greater freedom for the Incumbent and the Parochial Church Council to use their own judgment in this matter. In special cases where the Bishop allows exceptions from his rule, he requires the preacher to speak from the lectern and not from the pulpit—one of those irritating and unnecessary regulations which cause unnecessary feeling. One cannot in a review discuss the large questions relating to marriage and divorce. But one is sorry to see that admission to Holy Communion of divorced persons should be left to the decision of the Bishop. People do not usually apply for admission to Holy Communion as they apply for admission to a hospital. They often have to

be urged to come, and the obvious person to do this is their Vicar who knows them.

The theme of *The Sacraments and the Church* is that the Church and not the individual is the unit of Christianity. It is difficult really to know what is meant by this statement. We were each probably aware of ourselves as 'I' before we were fully aware of our constituent parts. The Israelites were aware of themselves as a congregation before Jeremiah and Ezekiel discovered the individual. On the other side, the parts of the body only reach their perfection as parts of a body, and Christian individuals only reach perfection in their place in the kingdom of God. The units for the present are the individuals, incorporated in Christ's Church, and the final unity towards which we are working is not the Church, nor even the kingdom of God, but God Himself who is all in all. The failures of most doctrines of the Church arise from looking at it now as the unity which it will only become when it is perfect. It is simply untrue to say, 'the Church is a unit as a society set over against the world.' The sacraments of the Church are of course not individual (that is an error into which common people fall, but can scarcely be laid at the door of the well informed); but they are wider than the Church. For they admit to the fellowship of the Church, of the Kingdom, and of God. To emphasise the relation of the sacraments to the Church may be necessary in the first instance, as with children of catechism age. But we cannot stop there. Sooner or later the growing child learns that the Church as it now is is neither one, nor holy, nor catholic, nor apostolic. The sacraments are the means of fellowship in the wider unity that will be one, holy, catholic and apostolic. The usefulness of a book of this kind in the practical life of the Church is not denied. But the great trouble to-day is that the Church is criticised — and rightly criticised—for its imperfections; and no doctrine of the Church will satisfy the modern man that does not look forward to what the Church is destined to do in the task of bringing in the kingdom, and beyond that to the time when Christ shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father.

L. E. Browne.

POPULAR MODERNISM*

The modern Christian teacher is faced to-day with a great difficulty, the wide difference in knowledge between the pulpit and the pew. The scientific study of religion, dogma and the Bible has revolutionized our approach to these subjects. But while there are plenty of large books to explain the method and results of modern criticism, there are not enough small ones. The effect is that the laity, and many of the clergy too, know little about

* The Interpreter Series. Vol. 1: *Belief in God,* by R. B. Henderson, M.A. (Oxon), B.D. (Lambeth). Vol. 2: *Job,* by T. W. Phillips, B.A. Vol. 5: *Christianity and the Future Life,* by Guy Kendall, M.A. (Oxon). (Murby & Co. 1938. 1/- each.)

them. In a certain clerical society many attacks have been made on the Doctrinal Report. But when it was proposed to take the Report as their book to study, the members said it was 'too stiff.'

A new series of books at 1/- each, called the Interpreter Series, has been started, under the editorship of Mr. R. B. Henderson, Chairman of the Council of the Modern Churchmen's Union and Headmaster of Alleyn's School, to give people the results of modern criticism in untechnical language. The subject of the first volume is very properly Belief in God, by the Editor himself. Mr. Henderson begins with a discussion of the scientific method, the way in which scientists form hypotheses, draw conclusions and verify them. He then proceeds to examine in the scientific manner our reasons for belief in God. He restates the cosmological and teleological arguments, using the conclusions of modern science; while in his hands the ontological argument becomes an argument for the real existence of values. Here he goes further than Dr. F. R. Tennant in *Theological Philosophy* would allow. We cannot argue that a thing is because it ought to be. We must first establish the rationality and morality of the world order before we can be reasonably sure that man's value judgments of reality are valid. Perhaps Mr. Henderson would have strengthened his argument if he had given more space to proving the primacy of mind over matter in the world order. Nevertheless his book will be most helpful to clergy and laity alike. It seems that Church people hear reasons for believing in God so rarely, that many think one must take Him on trust, in blind faith. Mr. Henderson shows that if the world is rational at all, then common experience gives us stronger reasons for believing in God than for disbelieving.

The most serious objection to belief in God is the problem of evil. The second volume in the Interpreter Series is on Job, and handles the problem as it is presented in this book. The author, Mr. T. W. Phillips, accepts on the whole the general results of the literary criticism of Job, except that he judges the Elihu speeches to be an essential part of the book. But he has a new and most interesting theory to offer of its meaning. According to the usual interpretation the author sides with Job. Job was right and his friends wrong. He was justified in maintaining his innocency. The author's purpose is to prove that suffering in this life is not necessarily the result of divine punishment for sin. But Mr. Phillips insists that Job was also at fault.

> 'He was a strong-willed man and very determined.' 'The one thing necessary for him was to learn humility.' 'Job did not ask for mercy; it was justice he wanted, and he was convinced that God was unjust.' 'It was a case of power against power, and to a man like Job the one thing that would make the strongest appeal would be the exhibition of immensely superior power.'

Mr. Phillips insists that the purpose of the book, so far as Job is concerned,

is to show that man must not try to put himself on an equality with God. Job's self-righteousness had to be broken.

> 'His proud nature had to be broken.' 'In the presence of that Power (God) he suddenly realised the insignificance of all that he stood for.' 'Then as he submitted, he learnt how infinitely kind the Power was to those who live in harmony with it.'

The fifth volume in the Interpreter Series is by Mr. Guy Kendall, formerly Headmaster of University College School, and deals with the third main topic of Christian philosophy, 'Christianity and the Future Life.' This volume without saying anything particularly new is a most useful one. For, while belief in a future life is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity, many people do not know how to support it by argument when 'proofs' from the Bible are barred. Mr. Kendall begins with a review of primitive beliefs, and passes on to consider the doctrines contained in the Old and New Testaments, with their development. Next, he discusses the philosophical arguments, including a consideration of the doctrine of Karma and of modern views, among them spiritualism. His conclusions are:

1. Spiritualism.

> 'If it were established by psychical research that some lives are known to continue beyond death . . . then the importance of the discovery would be the knowledge that the soul can survive the body. For it would defeat the materialist's contention that the conscious life of a man is necessarily limited by the duration of the brain.'

But Mr. Kendall thinks that we do not yet know enough 'to come to any definite conclusion about the meaning of abnormal psychic phenomena.'

2. Philosophy.

> 'Philosophical inquiry can perhaps give assurance of the eternity of Spirit. But it cannot on metaphysical grounds give proof of the natural immortality of the individual soul.'

3. Christianity.

> 'The Christian theory of immortality has its true basis in the whole conception of the world, and of the world's government which it sets forth. The revelation of the Fatherhood of God and the conception of the value of the individual life which follows, is stultified if the short span of years which is the lot of man on earth has no further continuance.'

These three volumes are not always quite such easy reading or so untechnical as popular books ought to be. But their difficulties, where any occur, are short, and worth surmounting. They are modern in the best sense, and will be a great help to many in making their ideas clearer, and in harmonising Christian faith with modern knowledge.

J. K. Nettlefold.

ANGLICANISM IN TRANSITION*

Father Humphrey Johnson is a member of the community of St. Philip Neri founded by Newman in Birmingham in 1848. Like the great Cardinal, he is a convert, for he was brought up as an Anglican but entered the Roman Church at the age of twenty-one. His book makes interesting reading, for it contains little or none of that bitter invective to which we are accustomed from some converts to Roman Catholicism. On the contrary, it is scholarly, judicious and temperate in its judgments.

Father Johnson is on firm ground when he points out that the story of the Church of England since the Reformation is, to a remarkable degree, the story of the Prayer Book, of its successive revisions and attempts at revision. To the changes and compromises made on the accession of Elizabeth he largely attributes the particular genius of the Church of England:

> 'The importance of these alterations far outweighed the space which they occupied. It is not an exaggeration to say that they have made the Church of England what it is, the Church which, as the late Archbishop Davidson put it, was able to embrace the followers both of John Keble and Charles Simeon' (p. 7).

What helped to make Anglicanism a genuinely national religion in England was the Papal Bull of 1570 deposing Elizabeth. Mr. Belloc has called it 'a first class blunder' while Manning, on the other hand, in a moment of controversial exuberance, declared it to be 'right, lawful and just.' Father Johnson says of it:

> 'It is difficult to believe that it did not serve to keep many men belonging to the school of Laud and Ken from finding their way back to the allegiance of the Holy See' (p. 11).

Men faced with the choice of loyalties chose to be loyal to their Queen rather than to the Pope.

In his treatment of the XXXIX Articles agreed upon by Convocation in 1562 Father Johnson is not altogether satisfactory. He appears to take no account at all of Newman's argument in Tract XC — an argument the legitimacy of which, so far as the present writer is aware, Newman never subsequently denied. Nevertheless, Father Johnson holds, as we hold, that the Articles were intended to be inclusive of various types of Christian thought, rather than exclusive. Indeed, he sees in this intention the first seeds of Latitudinarianism or Liberalism or Modernism. Of Modernism he says:

> 'Viewed in its historical setting Modernism was the continuation of a process, at work since the beginning of Christian history, by which currents of thought outside the Church have endeavoured in various forms to acclimatize themselves within her' (p. 73).

He maintains that the State has been the principal instrument by means of

* *Anglicanism in Transition.* By Humphrey Johnson. (Longmans. 6/-. 1938.)

which Modernism has acquired a home within the Church of England. From the time when Convocation was suppressed by George I before it could censure Bishop Hoadley's sermon on 'The Kingdom of Christ,' the State has consistently opposed or obstructed any attempt on the part of the Anglican Church authorities to define or draw in her doctrinal boundaries. Compromise, Father Johnson considers to be the quintessence of Anglicanism.

> '. . . when there appears within its bosom a commanding personality of uncompromising bent, one of two things must happen. The Church of England may follow him, even to its ruin . . . or she may, by refusing his lead, lose him' (p. 177).

He points to the fact that while the three great names in Anglican history which dwarf all others are those of Laud, Wesley and Newman, not one of them died 'as Anglican clergymen normally die.'

> 'Laud met his end on the scaffold, amid the ruin of the system of worship which he had sought to impose on all his fellow-countrymen. Wesley died as the initiator of a schismatic movement, Newman as a Roman Cardinal.'

Here is food for thought. We may well ask, however, whether or not the tragedy of Wesley and perhaps also the loss of Newman, were not due so much to the spirit of compromise within the Church of England as to the lack of it. Certainly, in the case of Wesley a greater spirit of kindliness and toleration would have retained his followers within the Church's fold.

The title of Father Johnson's book must naturally cause us to inquire concerning the *terminus ad quem* of the Church of England. He believes that, just as the Church has compromised in doctrinal matters, so too it will in matters ethical. Already, he says,

> 'it is difficult for men who take the old view of Christianity as a body of divinely revealed truths to feel spiritually at home within the Church of England. The dividing line between Anglicans and Free Churchmen now affects questions of organization, rather than of belief, and even that between the former and Unitarianism has become blurred' (p. 221).

We heartily wish that this were so, but we fear that Father Johnson takes too rosy a view of the situation. Neither the debates in Convocation nor the recently published Doctrinal Report substantiate the assertion that 'the dividing line between Anglicans and Free Churchmen now affects questions of organization, rather than of belief.' Indeed, such an assertion begs the whole question, for questions of organization depend very largely on the doctrinal beliefs underlying them. The question of Episcopacy, for instance, is not primarily one of organization but of doctrine.

What is the future of religion in England going to be? Father Johnson makes an interesting speculation:

> 'The English soil on which Lollardy, Puritanism and Methodism have arisen may give birth, during the next century, to another movement kindred to these. The indefinite character of the type of religion,

> offered by official Anglicanism, might lead to a considerable portion of the population, feeling it to be too invertebrate for them, to follow some freak religion should a charlatan endowed with a high degree of personal magnetism, and possessed of the oratorical powers of a Whitefield, appear, to lead such a movement. Such a religion would, perhaps, possess a superficially Protestant colouring, and make use of the name of Christ. In an eventuality of this kind, English religion might come to assume a curious parallel to Roman religion in the second and third centuries, when the old Roman religion survived as a religion of the State, while personal cravings for communion with the unseen were satisfied by adhesion to one of the mystery religions. The official Anglican Church would serve as the focus of the public emotion, at times of national rejoicing or calamity, and give a religious background to state ceremonial, as well as to weddings and funerals, while vital currents in English religious life would seek an outlet in other channels ' (p. 219).

Apparently, Father Johnson has little belief that his own Church will come to the fore as a means of outlet for ' vital currents in English religious life.'

We have two main criticisms to make of this book. In the first place, its title should have been ' The Church of England in Transition.' After all, Anglicanism is no longer confined to these shores, but is a world-wide communion. It is not without significance that the present President of the United States is a devout communicant of the American Episcopal Church, the Anglican Church as it exists in the United States. In the second place, we do not accept Father Johnson's definition of Modernism. Throughout his book he clearly regards Modernism as a movement within the Church whose sole *raison d'être* is to dissolve, or at least reduce to a nebulous mass, the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. So far from this being the case, Modernism, to use the words of the late Professor Percy Gardner, ' is based upon evolution in science and the critical method in history ; and it demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge, and restated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age.' The Modernist believes that increasingly as this demand is met the Church will gain immeasurably in power and real influence.

Father Johnson's book contains an appendix on the Doctrinal Report which is superficial and inadequate in its treatment. Running through it is his strange misconception of the nature and scope of a wise and balanced Modernism. Consequently, it is not surprising that he wonders whether ' the residuum of positive Christian belief contained in the Report is broad enough to give a firm footing to those who are launching the campaign for a national " Recall to Religion." ' We should have thought that belief in the love of God and the power of Christ's message would have proved a broad enough foundation for any recall to religion. Nevertheless, in the main this book is an acute examination of contemporary Anglicanism in England, and as such may be read by an Anglican with interest and profit.

W. J. Cratchley.

JEWISH AND BARTHIAN VIEWS OF REVELATION *

An interesting book could be written on the influence of Jewish thinkers, from Maimonides onwards, upon Western Europe. In the work before us Dr. Lichtigfeld has dealt with the ideas, in relation to religion, of certain modern Jewish thinkers — some of them of the very first importance, for example, Henri Bergson, Samuel Alexander, Freud and Husserl. But he is concerned not only with Jewish exponents of a philosophical standpoint, but also with Jewish upholders of the idea of Revelation, for example, Hertz, Baeck, Breuer, Rosenheim, and others.

Dr. Lichtigfeld's comments upon the ideas of the philosophers show a true appreciation of the essential nature of religion. For example, on Alexander's idea of Deity as an emergent quality, he comments as follows:

> 'This conception cannot meet the need of the religious individual and likewise does not do justice to the historical appearance of religion. . . .
>
> 'Not only ought our present experience and the development of natural sciences to be taken into account in any explanation of the world, but also the historically religious development of mankind.
>
> 'For instance, the most important feature in the history of religion, namely, the distinction between holy and profane, is not discussed by Alexander. . . . In what way can it be possible that such a fundamental distinction could emerge from the human mind?
>
> 'It is a distinction which involves a feeling of apprehended holiness in the Infinite, qualitatively different from anything that natural sense-perception is capable of giving us. Is it not a strange fact that to-day, like centuries ago, the Saint is considered as the highest development of human nature?
>
> 'Whence comes this most surprising of all the facts in the history of religion? We see, in the case of the Saint, that man's individuality is not his highest truth; there is that in him which has a tendency towards holiness. Only by discovering this and acting upon it, do we realise the meaning of the universe.'

Alexander speaks of 'A craving for something we know not what.' But the desire of the individual mind to transcend itself and pass beyond the limit of its own individuality 'shows that God has implanted in His works a striving, a longing . . . a tendency directed towards Himself as the origin of all things.' All this section is of great value; in fact this work is a highly perceptive and sensitive exposition of a theistic standpoint, *based upon an understanding of religion* — a thing sufficiently rare in modern 'scientific' apologetic, which too often does not pass beyond giving us a God who is a Mathematician (as if that interested anyone with an understanding of religion as it has displayed itself in history and still manifests itself to-day !).

* *Philosophy and Revelation in the Work of Jewish Thinkers.* By Dr. A. Lichtigfeld. (M. L. Cailingold. London. 7/6.)

Karl Barth's Idea of Revelation. By Peter H. Monsma, Th.B., Ph.D. (Somerset Somerville, N.J. $2.00.)

Karl Barth's theology is a protest against all 'humanism' in religious thinking. For Barth a God between whom and man there is no unending qualitative difference, or absolute discontinuity, is no real God. For Barth also faith is something that has an independent validity, which neither can nor need be justified or confirmed by reason or any other form of human experience. The two propositions indeed are logically connected, because if God is essentially diverse from man, he must lie outside the range of all normal human faculties, and a special extra faculty must be superimposed on man's outfit to enable him to apprehend God at all. Dr. Monsma's book sounds a clear and emphatic No to these central ideas of Barth's eccentric theology. Eccentric is the appropriate term, since it is out of line with the European, Christian tradition, whereby men are 'Sons of God,' and reason a divine faculty. Barthianism seems to be a characteristic post-war phenomenon. There is, of course, an attraction in this doctrine. As Dr. Monsma says:

> 'In it God comes to man; weak man need no longer struggle to find and to rise to God. He is there. All man's uncertainty, man's fear, man's questioning is ended; and all his pride, presumption, and vanity too. Reality seems big, and man as a recognised part of it far bigger than he seemed before.'

Can it be that Barthianism is a religion of despair—a product of a mentality similar to that of the depressing epoch when Saint Augustine penned his *De Civitate Dei*? But be its psychological origin what it may, Dr. Monsma has done an important service by subjecting the Barthian system, in its development, to a careful critical analysis.

J. C. Hardwick.

SHORT NOTICES

LIVING WORDS.*

Shakespeare says:

Lysander: A good moral, my Lord: it is not enough to speak but to speak true.

Hippolyta: Indeed he (Quince) hath played on his prologue like a child on a recorder; a sound, but not in government.

Theseus: His speech was like a tangled chain; nothing impaired, but all disordered. 'A Midsummer Night's Dream,' Act V, Sc. I.

Speaking is an art, long recognised, but narrowly developed. So we welcome this 'Study in Perfect Utterance' which will commend itself to all who would apply Lysander's moral.

The clergy—as it is remarked in the introduction (p. 10)—are especially subject to the danger of 'devitalised' speech. And, there is the equal danger of an obtrusive 'ego.' These together with most of the difficulties of speaking in prose and verse are carefully examined and prescribed for in seven parts. The fourth part which deals with Interpretation is enlightening. It precedes two brief sections on Teaching and Choral Speaking, while

* *Vital Speech.* By Harold J. Ripper. xvi plus 198 pages. (Methuen. 5/-. 1938.) Introduction by Henry W. Nevinson.

Parts I—III treat the causes of weak utterance and give exercises for their removal.

Special attention is paid to the effect of educational methods on the development of speech and it is observed:

> 'Most children and most adults speak under the difficulty of having to overcome *unconsciously remembered fear* in the very act of speech' (p. 8).

The italics are the author's, whose remedy is:

> 'We can see to it that nothing we do or say shall damage the child's sense of its own value to us and to others' (p. 10).

Though teachers and students may disagree with some statements which are not strictly relevant to the main theme of vocal expression, Mr. Ripper is surely right where, in Part VII, 'The Root of the Matter,' he says:

> 'The real cause of non-vital speech lies hidden in the mind of the speaker' (p. 181).

We agree. For if everyone thought it natural to voice themselves in some degree 'with authority' they would do so—more acceptably and more easily, perhaps, after special instruction. Yet, for practising the art as a 'skilled' or 'unskilled' speaker, there is help in this book, not least in its masterly closing lines:

> 'To remember without fear,
> To feel without pretence,
> To know all we are, and have been, and are likely to be;
> To love rightness,
> And beauty born of rightness,
> And truth which is their relationship:
> And to reveal all these with courage and simplicity,
> And without any artifice:
> To do this is to speak with magic,
> With inspiration,
> And with power.'

Indeed, when God is served, does He not hear living words?

W.T.A.P.

TEACHING TEACHERS TO TEACH.*

The Master and the Disciple is a great little book written by two former members of Ripon Hall for the use of teachers in Sunday Schools. But it will supply even a greater need than that. It can be used as a basis for simple, short sermons. Though the book is called Sunday School Lessons, it is really a Homiletic Encyclopaedia. It shows how to use the Bible to stimulate the mind and conscience by dividing into sections the hero, martyr and saint stories: the poetry and great prose, the hymns and songs and wise sayings of the greatest book in the world. The prices and publishers of inexpensive books which further develop the theme are given: an inestimable boon to the enthusiastic teacher. Moreover, the writers realize the contribution made by heroes, martyrs and saints who have lived since Bible days and such lives are used for further illustrations of great and true living. And in this case also the titles of inexpensive books are provided in which the study of this aspect of the subject may be pursued. The Lessons are arranged under arresting titles such as: 'Men who heard God's Call in

* *The Master and the Disciple.* General Editors, J. P. Hodges and R. B. Parker. (Published for the A.E.G.M. by the S.P.C.K. 2/3 post free. 1938.)

the Old Testament,' 'Growing to Know Jesus,' 'How Jesus Brought Out the Best in People,' 'Some People whom Jesus Met.'

Prayers and hymns are not forgotten and suggestions are made as to the appropriate choice for different lessons. The choice of hymns, especially for young children, is an important part of their teaching. They may be too young to understand the lesson completely, but the refrain and words of a hymn will recur to them and so bring home in later years the value of a lesson which perhaps they were too young to appreciate at the time it was imparted. Prayer-hymns are invaluable for this purpose.

M.E.M.

CHALLENGE!*

Those who are looking for a book which in the short compass of 114 pages surveys the whole Bible, and extracts from it the message of God to man and the challenge which this has meant to each generation, may find this in Mr. Bennett's book. Whether it will satisfy them depends on the purpose which they have in mind. It certainly offers a fresh presentation of the Bible story. It is colourful, especially in its choice of adverbs—*terribly dangerous, simply furious, absolutely determined, extremely fluent, very difficult,* all occur on one half-page.

As it covers so much ground, it is inevitably superficial in discussing the difficulties of meeting religion's challenge to the modern world. 'If industry can't be run on Christian lines, then it jolly well must be changed' (p. 110), is a typical sentence—though it suggests the undergraduate putting the world right in a debating circle. But the writer has shown some originality in his approach to the Bible and we suggest that this book might well form the basis of talks to a Bible class. The Archbishop of York has contributed the Foreword.

J.P.H.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

CLAUDE MONTEFIORE: A POSTSCRIPT

By Arnold Page, formerly Dean of Peterborough.

Sir,

I was, I feel sure, Claude Montefiore's oldest friend, as certainly he was mine. When he was sixteen I was, on Jowett's recommendation, his tutor at Coldeast, a few miles from Southampton, afterwards so honourably connected with his name. He could not have gone to a public school. For one thing, his health had been somewhat undermined by inflammation of the lungs. For another, there was not then available what (Canon) Glazebrook started later at Clifton—a house for Jews. His tutor hitherto had been (afterwards Sir) Philip Magnus, then a junior minister at one of the synagogues, an interesting and able teacher who generally spent the mid-week days at Coldeast. His teaching was largely in elementary science, for which Claude had a variety of appliances. But from his birth, and as long as his elder brother Leonard lived, it had almost been taken for granted that he would become a Rabbi. In a sense a Rabbi he remained to the end of his life, with the advantage that he was his own very critical congregation at the same time.

But it was thought now that his education should be more general and that he should be prepared for an extrance examination at London Uni-

* *Challenge.* M. R. Bennett. (114 pp. 3/6. Longmans. 1938.)

versity. Greek was one of the subjects, and we followed what was, I suppose, a new method—except as babies learn their own tongue. The letters took a day. Then, chucking grammars to the dogs, we recited in a sort of sing-song, in which he imitated me, a few verses of the Odyssey, which he always preferred to the Iliad, though he read both afterwards again and again. It was of course an arduous task to explain next each word, but we made a joke of it. How it would have answered with other boys I cannot say, but anyway, when the examination came along, Claude was among the first thirty of three hundred candidates. Whether his Greek helped or hindered, I do not know. A few years later he got his First in Classical Greats at Oxford.

I had two other fairly longish spells at Coldeast, and I coached him for several months in London. But I had to attend to my own preparation for my future life, and I was succeeded by Glazebrook and by, I think, L. G. Field. Glazebrook became a very dear friend of his.

I was rather nervous about entering a Jewish household. I had, so far as I knew, never seen any Jew before, except Claude's elder brother Leonard, of whom I had seen something. But I was delightfully undeceived. From the first day onward I was not a hireling but a friend. I was rather flabbergasted to find that German was a current medium of conversation, partly because a Miss Glünder, who was German and had been governess to Claude's unmarried sister Charlotte (afterwards Lady MacIver), and stayed on as her companion, spoke English almost as badly as I spoke German. But I at once found myself at home. For a good many years afterwards Claude used to send me almost everything he thought of printing, not for criticism of the matter, but rather because his English still retained a German flavour.

He was a bright and merry boy, full of fun. He played billiards fairly well, generally with his father, the kindest of men, and, strange to say, he loved racing — in the newspapers — a taste he had acquired from a near relative who was great in that as well as in other ways. Claude knew the names of all the favourites and the odds for and against.

Our outdoor dissipation was riding, in which *à trois* we scoured the country for miles and miles with his younger sister. I fear we must have bored her awfully by reciting Shakespeare's Sonnets, most of which we knew by heart, at the top of our voices. Claude was not allowed out when the wind was in the East. The family joke was that, when the wind was in some other quarter, and the coachman wanted a holiday, he tied up the stable vane in accordance with his wishes. We defeated him when rides *à deux* were permitted.

The Montefiores had not many neighbours whom they knew. But the house was the frequent resort of interesting people. I remember best the elder sister, Alice Lucas, a charming woman and no mean poetess.

In London I was in close touch with them. An extraordinary kindness was, that when we were all in town they put at my disposal a horse on which I might ride whenever I liked with Claude and his sister Charlotte. I frequently stayed not only at Coldeast, when Mr. Montefiore sometimes took me for short trips on the yacht he still kept, but also in Claude's and his Mother's houses on the North side of Portman Square. His Mother was always busied in good works. Every morning almost she spent an hour or two looking into her charitable accounts. One of the chief of these was Miss Octavia Hill's and Miss Cons' wise activity in regard to the housing of the poor. I knew them both, and no one helped them more generously than Mrs. Montefiore. Servants seemed never to leave, except when old age came on, when they received good pensions.

I became curate to William Rogers, Rector of Bishopsgate, a man destined to higher preferment had he not injured his spine while riding at his home near Mickleham. Perhaps on account of this disability — though it did not prevent his attention to duty — he left more liberty than usual to myself and my fellow-curate, R. H. Hadden, who wrote his life. Rogers was nicknamed 'Hang Theology' — Hadden explains why. The only theology he wanted to hang was of the embittered sectarian variety. Then, if not now, many Jews lived in the parish, with Irish Roman Catholics as servants. Rogers insisted that they should all be visited and looked after. On Claude's introduction I got the Chief Rabbi to arrange that Jewish religious teaching should be given to Jews in our Church School.

When I left London in 1886 for Tendring in Essex, a Balliol living given me, Claude and his first wife, a very lovable woman though rather shy and bashful in new surroundings, were, as soon as the house was ready, almost my first visitors. She died on, or very nearly on, my wedding-day. But Claude was with us in a few weeks, and thereafter, both at Tendring and at Peterborough, there was seldom a year when he did not visit us, generally more than once for a long week-end.

At his own instance he helped me most generously in what were then social experiments. I was enabled to keep a sick-nurse midwife, then a rare luxury in a country parish, and both in school and in the workhouse to take steps forward which have now become usual—at the tax-payers' or the rate-payers' expense.

Of his later life I need say little. It is probably known to most readers of the *Modern Churchman*. I was disappointed in seeing less of him than I had hoped when I settled in London. My health was poor, and that was why I had resigned the Deanery at Peterborough, while as I was now hard of hearing it was useless for me to attend Claude's meetings and religious services. But he was seldom in London for a week or two without coming to see me. We spent some time together at the Lakes in 1937; a year or two before we cruised to Constantinople. My wife, who died about two months before he did, found in him, as in his Mother, as close and affectionate a friend as I had found. He dedicated one of his books to me.

Through Claude and his Mother I became acquainted with many Jews, but naturally they were not of the class which bears the scars and defects resulting from age-long cruelty. They were among the best citizens England has. In substance, Claude's fear was that if there were a Jewish state, Jews domiciled in other countries would become aliens. At all events that was part of his objection to Balfour's Palestine plan. Claude's Mother had an aphorism, 'As we grow older, we learn to make allowances.' I should like to put in a word even for some Germans. Long ago I spent a goodish while in Germany and made friends whose only fault was that they would speak English to me. I do not believe that Germans of the same class now are barbarians. But for one thing they are not allowed to know the truth, and for another they would effect nothing by facing concentration camps and possibly a 'purge.' As for the Jews, persecution has confined them to, and almost forced them into, occupations in which consequently they have learned to excel; and this excites jealousy. I think Claude would have agreed.

One word more. In all ethical respects, though of course in no sense theologically, Claude and his Mother and other Jews like them were, and are, better Christians than many of us who profess to be Christians. Claude and I found nothing inconsistent in worshipping God together whether in synagogue or in church, and our religions drew nearer, though they did not coalesce, in spirit and in hope.

A. Page.

THE FORTY STRIPES SAVE ONE.

SIR,

Give me leave to emphasize the view expressed in the November issue of the *Modern Churchman* (p. 412) that the Dean of St. Paul's adopts a mistaken course in proposing to revise the Thirty-nine Articles. Even should he succeed in obtaining general assent for his revision, which seems unlikely, it is obvious that presently this again would require to be revised. There are, however, two alternatives, both of which appear better than the Dean's proposal. The Declaration of Assent may be amended by omitting mention of the Articles altogether, as was advocated by Hampden, Arnold, Milman and Stanley, or the pledges given in the Ordination Service may be supplemented by additional questions and answers, so that no further declaration is needed. Although the Articles are left in the Prayer Book of the American Episcopal Church, no subscription is required.

A brief glance at the history will be helpful here. The Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 was preceded by a Royal Commission, which in its composition was highly orthodox; but the majority seem to have been in a vague state of mind when they settled the declaration, and this persisted when the Bill was discussed in Parliament. The dominant idea was undoubtedly to substitute one straightforward declaration in place of the various complicated forms of subscription then in use. The older form ran: 'I, *A.B.*, do willingly and *ex animo* subscribe to the three articles imposed by the 36th canon,' which articles were (1) a declaration of the Royal supremacy in all causes and over all persons ecclesiastical as well as civil, (2) a declaration that the Book of Common Prayer 'contained nothing contrary to the Word of God,' (3) an acknowledgment that 'the Book of Articles and all and every the Articles therein contained, being nine and thirty in number, were agreeable to the Word of God.' These declarations were required of every ordained person, and in addition, by the Act of Uniformity, 13 & 14 Car. II, c. 4, § 5, every beneficed priest was required 'openly before the congregation to declare his unfeigned assent to all and everything in the Book of Common Prayer contained and prescribed.' The resources of language were exhausted in the stringency of the requirements. For these declarations the present form, which was approved by the Convocations, was substituted: 'I assent to the 39 Articles and to the Book of Common Prayer and to the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God, and in public and private administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other except in so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.' Since the meaning of the last phrase is now much in dispute it may be well, in passing, to quote the words of Sir George Grey in moving the second reading of the Bill: 'With reference to these last words,' he said, 'they point to the power exercised by the Queen in Council of ordering special prayers for occasions of public thanksgiving or calamity or such like other occasion' (*The Times*, June 23, 1865). Clearly the alteration made was far-reaching. The words 'unfeigned assent and consent' and '*ex animo*' disappear and the simple words 'I assent' are substituted. We assent to a certain arrangement, but we believe in a certain truth. 'I believe the doctrine' seems here to mean no more than 'I am of opinion,' and 'all and every of the doctrines' gives place to 'doctrine' in the singular. Yet few of the prelates seem to have realized the magnitude of the changes made. Alone in the House of Commons Mr. Buxton emphasized this, and claimed that it was the intention of the Bill to require only a general acceptance of the teaching and not the acceptance of every particular doctrine. 'Whereas at

present those who took orders or promotion in the Church were obliged to declare that they accepted all and everything contained in the Prayer Book or the Thirty-nine Articles, in future they would only affirm their acceptance of the doctrines of the Church contained in these books as a whole, without pledging themselves to a belief in every assertion and every dogma that the Church might have laid down.' At first it seemed likely that the bishops who guard the door of the Church, inasmuch as they have unfettered discretion as to the ordering of ministers, would interpret the Act so as to render it nugatory. Archbishop Longley in a pastoral pronounced that all the traditional doctrines as they had been handed down would be maintained 'at the exact level'; but the lawyers have given a more liberal interpretation than the promoters imagined.

It may be enquired whether it is not sufficient to allow this process to continue, and to trust to the liberal construction placed upon the Articles by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to give further elasticity to the existing declaration. It is probably preferable to proceed by way of legislation if the connection between the Established Church and the enlarged thought and intellect of the age is to be retained, and the Church is not to be officered by men socially and intellectually of a lower type. The divines of the present century are not so mentally inferior that they need shrink from revising the work of their elders, and subscription is not to be pressed beyond what the circumstances of the time require. The natural reluctance of the bishops to sanction heresy hunts renders it unlikely that there will be any more case-made law further liberalizing the interpretation of the formularies. Moreover, the student of the cases which have been decided by the Privy Council may doubt whether the judges, however liberally disposed, can extend the judicial frontiers of the Statute of 1865 so far as to acquit such Modernist theologians as the Bishop of Birmingham, the late Dean of St. Paul's and the Principal of Ripon Hall. Likely enough all three would be cast; for it is difficult to see how the teaching of these clerics on the Resurrection, for example, could, even by the most skilled advocacy, be reconciled with the explicit language of the fourth Article. And if a clergyman makes a clear statement which plainly contradicts an unambiguous statement in the Articles, condemnation follows.

It has sometimes been argued that in a divided Christendom the retention of the Articles is necessary to maintain a platform for the National Church against papal claims. It is true that a century ago they were deemed an efficacious bulwark to this end. Thus Lord Eldon records in his diary (Life by Twiss, Vol. II, p. 416) that on the defeat of the Catholic Emancipation Bill of 1821 by thirty-nine votes, it became a fashionable toast at London banquets to drink to the health of the thirty-nine who had 'saved the Articles.' But since the Newmanite interpretation of Tract '90' and the 'non-natural' interpretation of 'Ideal' Ward the contention lacks force. 'We find—Oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight!—we find the whole cycle of Roman doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen'; and again, 'Three years have passed since I said plainly that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman doctrine.' So writes Ward. Various mysterious sodalities with cryptic initials—S.S.C., O.C.R., C.B.S., A.P.U.C.—whose members are reputed to be addicted to papistry, have from time to time disturbed the peace of the Church; and at the summer session of the Church Assembly a statement published in the *Tablet* that more than a thousand clergymen accepted in full the dogmas of the Council of Trent, and were desirous of reunion with the papacy on this basis, was discussed. Although the number was reduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury in summarizing the debate to 335, this

seems too many. At the Malines Conference, too, it was common ground with both parties that the Articles were no bar to reunion with Rome.

This being so, I suggest that the better course would be to frame another question in the Ordination Service: 'Will you in Public Prayer and administration of the Sacraments use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer except as otherwise appointed by the laws ecclesiastical?' The third question relating to the Scriptures in the service for the Ordination of Deacons was in the Revised Book of 1928 altered in a modernist direction, though it does not appear that any of the bishops have thus far ventured to make use of it. The teaching of the Church is expressed in a suaver and more winning form in the Prayer Book than in the Articles, and if the questions in the Ordination Service were amended in the manner here suggested the Clerical Subscription Act of 1865 might be repealed. Then, if the Articles were removed from the Prayer Book, of which they form no true part, they would presently pass into the oblivion which has overtaken the three omitted in the final revision of 1562. Meanwhile, as a preparation of the public mind to that end, the Church Assembly should legislate so as to relieve the clergy from the duty of reading the Articles on induction to a benefice, which is not done either by deans or bishops on their appointment to more responsible positions.

A. ATKINSON.

SIR, TOC H AND INCLUSIVE CHRISTIANITY.

After spending some years on the Staff of Toc H and having been a member of the M.C.U. for many years now, I beg to bring to your notice certain thoughts which occurred strongly to me as I read the Editorial of the *Modern Churchman* this month. The arguments about the Bishop of Bristol's plea for re-union and those advanced as to the position of Unitarians all point in the same direction.

The future of the Church lies in a Society fashioned along the lines of Toc H.

Members of Toc H pledge themselves to 'listen now and always for the voice of God, to know His Will revealed in Christ, and to do it fearlessly, reckoning nothing of the world's opinion or its successes for ourselves or this our family, and towards this end (1) to think fairly, (2) to love widely, (3) to witness humbly, (4) to build bravely.'

It seems to me that in all the discussions about re-union we are continually refusing to face the fact that within the Church of England we already have two bodies which are utterly beyond doctrinal reconciliation, and there is certainly no chance whatever of re-union between the Anglo-Catholics and Nonconformity. There can be no kind of Credal plank thrown across the gulf, and all talk to this end is a sheer waste of time.

I can see only one possible method. First of all let us admit that we are disagreed not only in details but on fundamentals too. Let us be clear about that.

Once this is recognised we might form a Church upon some Credal basis as simple as that of Toc H, saying at the same time to the Anglo-Catholics, 'We know that you don't think we are orthodox and that this is not your idea of a Christian Church, nor is it ours, and we shall continue to pray for your conversion.'

But here you can keep your own beliefs and do your own teaching without molestation, and we shall do ours too. We are forming one Church not because we are agreed but because of Our Lord's commandment to let the wheat and the tares grow together. In His own good time He will make the truth plain, and if you believe in yourselves you will risk it.

Furthermore, we quite realise that this will let in Unitarians and others who may not be Christians at all. Cannot we envisage a Church which contains a number of such people? Surely the early Church contained many such. Surely, whatever regulations are made, the Church always does carry such.

Cannot we agree that a certain amount of mud can be allowed to stick to the outer rim of the cart-wheels? And is our corporate spirit of such feeble quality that we shall make no impression on such people as the years pass by? The supreme genius of Toc H was its superb faith that if only people could be brought to face the living Christ they would yield to Him.

At any rate this system has been tried in Toc H with astonishing success. When I was on the Staff I thought that many of my brethren held beliefs which were less than Christian, but I thought that they were Christians. I believe that quite a number of Anglo-Catholics thought that I was a Christian too, though they would not consider my beliefs good Churchmanship.

I am quite certain that we learned the better to love each other because of our constant association, and particularly because we knew that we should each go our own way, neither complaining nor coercing. Is it not in that fear of each other that the main bitterness lies? Under Toc H conditions perfect love got the bit in its teeth and cast it out.

As Toc H is the only Society in which Catholics, Liberals, Free Churchmen, and men of no particular belief, have settled into one Christian family, it always surprises me that the Church has never given due attention to its methods which are so manifestly successful.

Please excuse the length of this letter, but I feel that I am bringing something of importance to your notice.

J. E. E. TUNSTALL.

High Littleton Vicarage,
Somerset.
November, 1938.

SIR,

A GEOMETRICAL ERROR.

A letter in your last number from Mr. Hardwick began with the statement, 'In mathematics, if two points through which a curve passes are given, it is possible to construct the rest of the curve,' which must have left your readers gasping. It is wholly untrue. Even for so simple a curve as a circle, three points are necessary; for a parabola, four; for an ellipse, five; for a cubic curve, nine; and so on. A curve of the 10th degree could not be determined unless sixty-five points were given; and a curve of the 100th degree would require five thousand, one hundred and fifty. The general formula for the number of points required to determine completely a curve of the nth degree is $\frac{1}{2}n\,(n+3)$.

Mr. Hardwick, I am sure, knows this as well as I do; but I am left wondering what it was that he *meant* to say.

C. F. RUSSELL.

Crosby Lodge,
Blundellsands.

SIR,

MR. HARDWICK'S REPLY.

What I wrote is true of the geometry of the straight line, but not of course of the geometry of the curve. My blunder, however, does not affect the validity of my general argument.

J.C.H.